THE SLEEP OF BEHEMOTH

Disputing Peace and Violence in Medieval Europe, 1000-1200

JEHANGIR YEZDI MALEGAM

THE SLEEP OF BEHEMOTH

THE SLEEP OF BEHEMOTH

Disputing Peace and Violence in Medieval Europe, 1000–1200

JEHANGIR YEZDI MALEGAM

CORNELL UNIVERSITY PRESS
Ithaca and London

Copyright © 2013 by Cornell University

All rights reserved. Except for brief quotations in a review, this book, or parts thereof, must not be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher. For information, address Cornell University Press, Sage House, 512 East State Street, Ithaca, New York 14850.

First published 2013 by Cornell University Press

Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Malegam, Jehangir Yezdi, 1976–
The sleep of Behemoth: disputing peace and violence in medieval Europe, 1000–1200 / Jehangir Yezdi Malegam.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-0-8014-5132-4 (cloth: alk. paper)
1. Peace—Religious aspects—Catholic Church—History—To 1500. 2. Violence—Religious aspects—Catholic Church—History—To 1500. 3. Christianity and politics—Europe—History—To 1500. 4. Christianity and politics—Catholic Church—History—To 1500. 5. Europe—Church history—600–1500. I. Title.
BX1795.P43M25 2013
261.8'7309409021—dc23 2012038927

Cornell University Press strives to use environmentally responsible suppliers and materials to the fullest extent possible in the publishing of its books. Such materials include vegetable-based, low-VOC inks and acid-free papers that are recycled, totally chlorine-free, or partly composed of nonwood fibers. For further information, visit our website at www.cornellpress.cornell.edu.

Cloth printing 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

But when they shall say peace and security, then shall sudden destruction come upon them.

—1 Thessalonians 5.3

Contents

Acknowledgments *ix*
List of Abbreviations *xiii*

Introduction 1

1. Revising Peace: Reform and the Millennium 21
2. The Papal Reform: Peace Espoused and Repudiated 55
3. False Sacraments: Violence, Captivity, and Insurrection 76
4. Dueling Sacraments: The Communion of Judas Iscariot 115
5. Inner Peace: Discord, Discretion, and Discipline 153
6. Exporting Peace: Ecclesiology and Evangelism 190
7. Communes: Inversions of Peace 230
8. Disciplining Behemoth: Provisions for Secular Peace 264

Epilogue 297

Bibliography *305*
Index *325*

Acknowledgments

We thrive in an academic community when we take up, with fondness and gratitude, the society of its members. During the ten years of this book's evolution, I have accumulated several debts, not all of which can be mentioned here: Brad Gregory, Hester Gelber, Kathryn Miller, Paula Findlen, and Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht, my professors at Stanford; my fellow graduate students Abosede George, Alexander Bay, Suzanne Miller, Erika Monahan, Ian Read, and Junko Takeda. I am especially grateful to Brad for his mentorship and example as scholar and teacher. Thanks also to Dallas Denery, Igor Gorevich, Geoffrey Koziol, Steven Lee, John Ott, and Jay Rubenstein for discussions that improved the final product. For his kindness and hospitality alone, my debt to Guy Lobrichon would be great, but he also introduced me to the school of Laon and the protoscholastics. This would have been a different study without his advice, one much poorer in its theological investment.

The Geballe Dissertation writing fellowship at the Stanford Humanities Center allowed me to meet Johannes Fabian, Stephen Justice, Robert Royalty, and Christen Smith—encounters that liberated my project from its disciplinary confines. Supplementation from Stanford University's Graduate Research Opportunity grant allowed me to spend five months in Paris in 2004. I thank the staff at the Bibliothèque nationale de France Chambre des manuscrits, the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, and the Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes. I thank the History Department at George Washington University, where I expanded the chronological scope and refined the focus of this work. Andrew Zimmerman, Linda Levy Peck, and Marcie Norton were especially generous with ideas and advice. Jeffrey Cohen warmly welcomed a fellow medievalist. Jennifer Davis and Philip Rousseau of the Catholic University of America commented at length on my exploration of patristic material; thanks also to Katharine Jansen for our conversations about Franciscan peacemakers. My short time in Washington, D.C., would have been poorer without the friendship of David Silverman, Dean Kostantaras, Arun Adarkar, and Fiona Shrikhande.

Duke University and the Research Triangle have provided me with abundant resources, literary and collegial. As librarian and friend, Margaret Brill remains a pillar of strength. John Martin receives special thanks for his constant encouragement and attentiveness. Adriane Lentz-Smith, Emily Burrill, Katherine Charron, and Christian Lentz provided an important critical eye during the writing process. It has been an honor and a delight to confer on subjects of shared interest with Thomas Robisheaux, William Reddy, Malachi Hacohen, Dirk Bonker, Bruce Hall, Ronald Witt, Francis Newton, as well as Fiona Somerset of the University of Connecticut, Julie Mell of North Carolina State University, Richard E. Barton of UNC Greensboro, and Kevin Uhalde of Ohio University.

I owe much to historians that I have never met but whose approaches to church reform and languages of peace inspired my own: Gerd Tellenbach, Herbert Cowdrey, Ian S. Robinson, Robert A. Markus, Karl Morrison, Amy Remensnyder, and Thomas Sizgorich. While I retain the hope of meeting some of them, I lament the passing of others, especially those who have left much, much too soon. In a digital age, I must also acknowledge the great efforts by my fellow historians to make their research and translations available online for academics and nonacademics alike.

Peter Potter at Cornell University Press gave this manuscript a flattering amount of attention and shepherded it through the review and editorial process with a sure yet gentle hand: my gratitude to him and Kitty Liu for making the experience so enjoyable, and to Marian Rogers, Susan Specter, and Kate Mertes, who saw this book into production. I thank the Press's two reviewers for their careful reading of the manuscript and thorough comments. I hope I have done justice to this collective effort.

A portion of what I discuss in chapter 1 was previously published in "No Peace for the Wicked: Conflicting Visions of Peacemaking in an Eleventh-Century Monastic Narrative," *Viator: Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 39, no. 1 (Spring, 2008), 23–49.

I thank Teresa Nava Andersen, Jonathan Ajo-Franklin, Dana Green, and Carol Pal for their enduring friendship. Brett Whalen has been a colleague and friend from our time together in graduate school; he remains my yardstick for professionalism and scholarship. Stephen D. White, a constant inspiration, teaches by example that we should not let the semblance of answers prevent us from making the question more complex; he exemplifies the beneficent restlessness at the heart of medieval notions of peace. Judith Miller has been a teacher, guide, and friend, in whose classroom I first decided that this was the life for me. Philippe Buc, once my adviser, now a colleague, ever

a generous friend and discerning critic: it has been an honor to count myself within your circle, and to work alongside you. My parents, Yezdi and Razu, have supported a meandering and hesitant journey into academia, and their love and patience across oceans and continents kept me going in difficult times, as did the presence of my sister Farah. In addition to her advice and encouragement regarding this book, Kathryn Mathers, my first recourse and ultimate resort, has made a life for us through her strength and love.

This book is dedicated to our twin daughters, Antonia Zarine and Nina McCreadie, who waited patiently for the manuscript to go to press before emerging into this world—the last time they waited patiently for anything. If nothing else, let this give them the sleep they need.

Abbreviations

Acta SS	Acta sanctorum quotquot toto orbe coluntur. Edited by the Bollandists. 68 vols. plus supplements. Paris, 1863–1940.
Arsenal	Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal.
BnF	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France.
BnF Lat	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, fonds latins.
BnF N.A.L.	Bibliothèque nationale de France, nouvelles acquisitions latines.
CCCM	Corpus Christianorum: Continuatio medievalis.
CCSL	Corpus Christianorum: Series latina.
CSEL	Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum.
Jaffé	Jaffé, Philip. *Regesta pontificum Romanorum*. Edited by S. Loewenfeld, R. Kaltenbrunner, and P. Ewald. Leipzig, 1885–88.
Mansi	Mansi, Giovan Domenico. *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*. Paris, 1903.
MGH	Monumenta Germaniae Historica.
MGH Const.	Monumenta Germaniae Historica constitutiones.
MGH Epp	Monumenta Germaniae Historica epistolae.
MGH LDL	Monumenta Germaniae Historica libelli de lite imperatorum et pontificum.
MGH SS	Monumenta Germaniae Historica scriptores.
MGH SSrG	Monumenta Germaniae Historica scriptores rerum Germanicarum.
MGH SSrGs	Monumenta Germaniae Historica scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum separatim editi.
PL	Patrologiae cursus completus: Series latina. Edited by J.-P. Migne. 221 vols. Paris, 1844–64.
Pont. Rom.	*Pontificum Romanorum Qui Fuerunt Inde Ab Exeunte Saeculo IX Usque Ad Finem Saeculi XIII Vitae Ab Aequalibus Conscriptae.* Edited by Johannes Mathias Watterich. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1862.

RHF	Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France. Edited by M.-J.-J. Brial and L. Delisle. Paris, 1879.
RTAM	*Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale.*

THE SLEEP OF BEHEMOTH

Introduction

In 1324, a physician and scholar named Marsilius of Padua refuted papal sovereignty in the name of peace. In his soon-to-be notorious *Defensor pacis* (Defender of the Peace), Marsilius asserted the legitimacy of a secular monarch over the clergy, insisting that the only true peace was earthly tranquility, and that tranquility was the exclusive province of the prince. Priests who bandied about their own claims to peacemaking were obstructing genuine peace and must be constrained to a sphere outside politics and statecraft. So convinced was he of the truth of his argument that Marsilius accompanied an imperial invasion of Rome in 1328 and served as "spiritual vicar" to the citizens after the pope had been driven into exile.

Like many before him who had pondered questions of political obedience, and many who would follow, Marsilius argued that successful maintenance of peace should override all other considerations about a ruler's legitimacy. He invoked Saint Augustine, who had reminded Christians that the prophet Jeremiah himself had endorsed secular authority, regardless of the prince's religion. Jeremiah had asked the Jews of the Babylonian Captivity to pray for the health of the gentile king Nebuchadnezzar. They must pray for the

king and his sons, and for peace to his city. Ultimately, counseled the prophet, "in their peace will be your peace."[1]

Defender of the Peace is widely regarded as one of the most important political treatises of the Middle Ages, and its appearance in 1324 marks a threshold in the evolution of Western political theory. Yet the ideas it espouses were long in the making. It should surprise no one that a political thinker in the fourteenth century would use peace as the fulcrum of an argument in which secular authority was elevated above clerical authority, or even that peace trumped all other considerations in the determination of a subject's obedience. But ironically, centuries of intellectual spadework by *clergymen* had led to this state of affairs: their own valorization of a monopolistic peace had forged an extraordinary weapon for critics to use against them. By Marsilius's time, peace could conceivably provide religious imperatives for exclusive obedience to a secular authority.

How did this happen? If we were to ask one of the greatest patristic authorities on the subject, he might remind us that even in Babylon, prophets had received warnings about the dangers of experimenting with peace. In two works, his *Homilies on Ezekiel* and his near-ubiquitous *Pastoral Care*, Saint Gregory the Great described how the word of God instructed Ezekiel to take up a tile and sketch on it an image of Jerusalem. Although the city's name translates as "vision of peace," Ezekiel was instructed to depict it with towers and fortresses: to prepare, in effect, for a long siege. Gregory interpreted Ezekiel's vision: when peace appears most clearly, then too do the forces of discord arise.[2] To Gregory, Ezekiel's vision of peace thus conveyed both a desired goal and an impending hazard. It pointed to an unattainable state of authentic concord, quietude, and delight in the divine embrace. On earth, such visions of peace could be hazardous, even misleading, when human beings confused imperfect reproductions of peace for the real thing.

Heedless to the warnings of their patristic forebears, however, church reformers of the eleventh and twelfth centuries attempted the perfection of peace on earth. For centuries, Christian thinkers had considered harmony between kingship and priesthood the standard of peace in an imperfect world. Then, between 1000 and 1200, reformers in the papal curia and monks and canons in the intellectual circles of northern France began to reimagine the church as a body whose task it was eventually to absorb all peoples through

1. Marsilius, *Defensor pacis* 2.5.7, ed. C. W. Previté-Orton (Cambridge, 1928), 155. See Peter Lombard, *Collectanea in omnes Pauli apostoli epistulas, epistolam I ad Timothaeum* 1.2, PL 192:337A. Cf. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 19.26, ed. Emanuel Hoffman, CSEL 40/2:421. Cf. Jer. 29.7.

2. Gregory the Great, *Regulae pastoralis liber* 2.10, PL 77:46C (henceforth *Reg. past.*). Cf. Ezek. 4.1.

progressive acts of revolutionary peacemaking. They envisioned this peace as faithful community, under a just regime, directed by spiritual authority, and comprising those who had been united by a turbulent transformation of desire and perception.

"Turbulence" is the key word here; to its proponents, genuine peacemaking practically demanded force and insurrection, an overturning of any tranquility that offered a credible facsimile of peace. In Latin, Christian Europe, therefore, new, often incompatible reformist agendas produced mutually negating visions of peace. From the height of the Peace of God assemblies in stateless Western Francia to the conceptualization of a secular peace in the decade after the Third Lateran Council, questioning the very meaning of peace allowed both clergy and laity to reflect on critical sociopolitical bonds and fidelities. At the same time, the pursuit of peace provided the impetus for ecclesiastical reform: new theologies of individual transformation, evangelical activity, and lay-clerical social engagement; and an imperative for clerical rebellion against royal theocracy.

The "Sleep of Behemoth"

This book traces the evolution of a medieval clerical discourse around peace, which framed great contests and negotiations between empire and papacy, communes and churches, even between spirit and flesh. It ends with the self-induced immolation of clerical political and social authority on the altar of an uncompromising, and ultimately unrealizable, mandate for churchmen to be peacemakers. Guiding these dangerous experiments was the fear that among most of humanity what passed for peace was mere tranquility aggrandized.

Writing late in the twelfth century, Rufinus of Sorrento called such an indolent peace the "sleep of Behemoth," after a creature that slumbers in shadow, under the cover of reeds in dark, swampy places: *sub umbra dormit in secreto calami in locis humectibus*.[3] A massive, lumbering beast first invoked in the book of Job, Behemoth has often been imagined as a monstrous water buffalo. According to Rufinus, its dangerous quiescence stood for lassitude in the church, tranquility in place of harmony, and subjugation as a substitute for justice. The Old Testament image would have resonated with popular fears and expectations, especially if enthusiastic reformers intended to disturb Behemoth's inglorious slumber. According to the twelfth-century

3. Rufinus of Sorrento, *De bono pacis* 1.8, ed. Roman Deutinger, MGH Studien und Texte 17:76 (henceforth *DBP*). Cf. Job 40.16.

Liber floridus attributed to Lambert of St-Omer, Behemoth, dormant from the world's beginning, will wake to herald its end: the Apocalypse. Extant manuscripts of the *Liber floridus* display a bovine but fanged Behemoth that serves as Satan's mount, its rude, bestial form symbolizing the fallen angel's spectacular descent from heaven as well as the dehumanization of all who cooperate with him.[4] On the reverse folio is its counterpart Leviathan, the sea serpent, a creature of stinking, overlapping scales, and, as we will see later in this book, the medieval embodiment of conspiracy.[5] Fittingly in the *Liber floridus*, Leviathan is the steed of Antichrist. Behemoth and Leviathan typified senseless compliance and wicked community respectively, two counterfeits of peace that haunted churchmen in eleventh- and twelfth-century Europe.[6]

As churchmen competed over the meaning and monopolization of the term "peace," they began to portray their own engagement with the world through a rubric in which true peace had shadows. Within major centers of intellectual activity and political thought—the papacy, the royal court of the Salian empire, reformist monastic and canonial orders, and the secular schools—the struggle for what Gerd Tellenbach calls "right order in the world" became a matter of distinguishing true peace from false. The human self, perpetually at war with itself, longed to possess a perfect harmony between spirit and flesh.[7] Consequently, human beings were easily lured by quietude and complacency, hazardous compromises between reason and appetite that had only the semblance of peace. False peace could include the temptations of political office, misguided friendships, and the perversion of love through arrogance and complacency.

Distinguishing peace from its illusions became the impetus for explorations of human sensibility, new attitudes toward the mysteries of scripture

---

4. See jacket cover for a depiction of Satan astride Behemoth from the *Liber floridus* (twelfth century), Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. Guelf 1 Gud. Lat., folio 41v.

5. See below, chapter 7. Cf. *DBP* 2.5, 108.

6. In her analysis of the Ghent *Liber floridus*, Suzanne Lewis has called attention to Lambert's use of imagery and text to indicate symmetry between Satan-Antichrist-Behemoth-Leviathan. See Lewis, "Encounters with Monsters at the End of Time: Some Early Medieval Visualizations of Apocalyptic Eschatology," *Different Visions: A Journal of New Perspectives on Medieval Art* 2 (June 2010): 46–53. The Wolfenbüttel MS displays some of the same interlinked symmetries.

7. Cf. Karl Morrison, *The Mimetic Tradition of Reform in the West* (Princeton, NJ, 1982), 69: "As Augustine lectured to his congregation on the problem of form and likeness in the theology of the Word, he attributed high importance to one premise: thought and Word were equal and identical in the Godhead, just as were seeing and being. All of Augustine's powerful discussion of man ruled out unity of that sort in human nature. He took for granted the duality of the inner and the outer man and, correspondingly, of inner and outward sight."

and sacrament, and refined articulations of the relationship between selfhood and community in a world of burgeoning sects and orders. As its most ardent seekers envisioned it, true peace often ran counter to the superficial forms of tranquility that had satisfied pagans or lulled nominal Christians into waywardness and sin. Between 1050 and 1200 the search for authentic peace became a mandate for reform through conflict, coercion, and insurrection, an antidote to prevailing but unacceptable modes of concord and community.

Thinking with Peace in the "Christian Middle Ages"

Why is it useful for historians to "think with peace" in the Middle Ages? Simply put, because it provides access to a language of aspiration and anxiety too often concealed in what appear to be bland, pastoral platitudes and hyperbolic denunciations of a vicious, medieval society. Peace takes the historian into a set of boundary conditions essential for Christian identity, for it punctuates the New Testament, the life and legacy of Christ. To announce his birth, angelic heralds proclaimed: "Peace on earth and good will to men," and as he departed from his followers Jesus remarked: "This peace I leave to you." Jesus's ministry in Galilee began when he urged his disciples to offer peace in every house. The moment of his death presented a final pacification of the will, commendation of the spirit into the hands of the father. At times Christ's pronouncements on peace may have appeared confusing: "I come not to bring peace but a sword." Nonetheless, peace became a boundary between New and Old Testaments such that, in the Incarnation, all manner of conflict, bloodshed, and wrath abated: they became allegories, or promises for future judgment.[8]

Of course, to undertake the study of peace in the Middle Ages means writing either the world's shortest or longest book. The period between 600 and 1500 has acquired a reputation for continuous warfare and conflict among kingdoms and communities. That image—exaggerated to some extent by chroniclers and litigants—has been revised in recent years as historians point out that fighting had its own patterns. Implicated within socially constitutive feuding systems, fighting could be read as critique, complaint, and negotiation. Indeed, making peace after the fighting was as combative

8. Cf. Philippe Buc, "Some Thoughts on the Christian Theology of Violence, Medieval and Modern, from the Middle Ages to the French Revolution," *Rivista di storia del Cristianesimo* 5.1 (2008): 111–113.

as the fighting itself, and since both helped maintain social and political relationships, neither should be regarded separately. But if peace and negotiation were one and the same, then one might follow Bernard of Clairvaux and echo the prophet Jeremiah's lament on partial remedies: "They say, 'peace, peace' and there is no peace."[9]

Complex and compelling models of strategy and performance may have mitigated the anarchic image of this era, but they cannot reconcile high medieval accounts of conflict with the period that Charles Homer Haskins once called the twelfth-century "Renaissance," a time of learning, building, and institutionalization.[10] My intervention allows us to integrate these seemingly discordant visions of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. I describe a world in which bloodshed was indeed fascinating, but not because it was exceptionally rampant or scarce. Instead, intellectual experiments with peace and violence expressed a vision of ecclesiastical reawakening.

Churchmen of the eleventh and twelfth centuries expressed conflict as those before them had not, carefully delineating where it was violence and where it was in fact peacemaking. This is not the same as the argument that violence was always someone else's aggression; in fact, the term *violentia* had a technical meaning that must be understood in relation to notions of captivity, deceived love, and falsification of sacramental bonds. Similarly, peace was not the absence or future abatement of conflict but rather the fighting itself. Christian thinkers had accepted that the nature of this world was war: on earth, peace was as easily discovered in fighting as it was in tranquility. Authentic peace was the insurrection of spirit against flesh in self and society, manifested in turbulent acts of transformation and regime change.

Historians can better discuss intellectual, political, and cultural transformations of this seemingly schizophrenic period by recognizing that Christian thinkers had long harbored both an extreme desire for peace and a deep suspicion of its manifestations on earth. Ever since the imperial persecutions of the third century, peace had provided a powerful boundary marker: the antithesis of the diabolical *Pax Romana*, the basis of Christian doctrines of resistance and at the same time a commentary on friendship, love, and betrayal. In the Middle Ages, it also served as a yardstick for measuring a sociopolitical

9. In the wake of the disastrous Second Crusade, to Pope Eugenius III, Bernard, *De consideratione* 2.1, PL 182:743: "Diximus pax, pax et non est pax promisimus bona, et ecce turbatio." (We said "peace, peace," and there is no peace. We promised good things, and "behold: turbulence.") Cf. Jer. 6.14.

10. Charles Homer Haskins, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, 1927).

order activated by oaths, sacraments, friendship, and fighting. Peace became a vehicle for disputing papal and imperial sovereignties, expressing suspicion of urban communes, justifying insurrection, and explaining reprisal. It linked thinking on the sacraments to concerns regarding wicked pacts, false prophets, and irresponsible rectors. And most tellingly for future theories of the state, peace demonstrated Augustine's seamless progression from harmony between spirit and flesh to domestic order to rectitude in government, focusing not only on the requirements of leaders but also on the internal transformations necessary for authentic membership in associations of faith or fidelity. Through an insistence on "true peace," churchmen made the emotional content of an individual's obedience the foundation for monopolistic government: the "invention" of the state through the reinvention of peace.

The Late Antique Legacy of Peace

By focusing on the eleventh and early twelfth centuries, a period of unstructured experimentation with ideas of peace, this book points to a reinvention of patristic and especially Augustinian authority at about the same time that medieval intellectuals were discovering Aristotle. The Augustine who appeared in these years was equally the author of *City of God*, *Genesis according to the Letter*, and the *Tractates on the Gospel of John*, at once the most influential theologian of the secular life, a pioneer of the literal-historical mode of scriptural exegesis, and a revolutionary exponent of sacramental theology. Medieval discussions of peace united these seemingly disparate topics. Not surprisingly, many of the participants belonged to a reconceived order of clergy, canons regular and secular, committed to a life on the threshold of altar and marketplace, who followed a remodeled Rule of Saint Augustine inspired by the saint's balance of pastoral and contemplative modes.[11] Peacemaking became an important part of their imagination of self, giving them unique roles of mediation between papacy and empire, wisdom and action, church and world.

---

11. *Libellus de diversis ordinibus et professionibus qui sunt in aecclesia*, ed. and trans. G. Constable and B. Smith (Oxford, 1972), 64 and 104–106 (henceforth *LDO*). While the author expresses doubts (shared by modern historians) regarding the attribution of the Rule to Augustine, he chooses to consider it Augustine's Rule, consistent with his equation between authorship and exemplum. We understand by this that Augustine's life and pastoral activity "wrote" the Rule regardless of who set it down. Marie-Dominique Chenu, "Monks, Canons, and Laymen in Search of the Apostolic Life," *Nature, Man, and Society in the Twelfth Century: Essays on New Theological Perspectives in the Latin West*, trans. Jerome Taylor and Lester K. Little (Chicago, 1968), 202–238.

But if attitudes toward peace during these centuries were only the revisitation of Augustine, suspicions of false peace would not have taken the shape that they did. Churchmen who experimented with peace took inspiration from an even earlier source, the Carthaginian bishop Cyprian, who had experienced imperial persecution at its height and who regarded times of peace and war as common imposters. While he could not have imagined a church permanently at peace with the world, Cyprian did understand the dangers of peace and its potential for falsification.

Between waves of imperial persecution, bishops like Cyprian found their authority threatened by the zeal and indiscipline of charismatic would-be martyrs. While Cyprian had gone into exile and many in his congregation had apostatized, a good few had suffered imprisonment; after peace returned, these "confessors" arrogated to themselves the responsibility for reconciliation and communion. For Cyprian, then, the Roman truce had only brought corruption. Enemies of true peace were exploiting brief tranquility to proffer their own chimeras: schismatic mirror churches, engines of war disguised as peace.

After the Decian persecutions of 251, Cyprian returned from exile warning that imperial assaults had been a blessing, strengthening Christians after many years of enervating tranquility. "The master of the house (*dominus*) wanted to test his family," said Cyprian. "And because the long peace corrupted the discipline that was divinely bequeathed to us, he has through heavenly censure aroused our prone and, it must be said, sleeping faith."[12] A return of peace provided new opportunities to lapse: this time through self-immolation at the altar of apostate prelates. Those who had resisted Roman persecution were issuing *libelli pacis* or letters of forgiveness to apostates and *traditores* who had handed over (*tradere*) the sacred texts for burning. Cyprian denounced these letters as empty sacraments, "against the law of the Lord and God a membership extended to the careless by the arrogance of certain individuals: an invalid and false peace, perilous to the givers and conveying no benefit to recipients."[13]

Faced with indiscipline among his flock, Cyprian reimagined the church as an army that must equally prepare for times of combat and tranquility.

---

12. See William Swann, "The Relationship between Penance, Reconciliation with the Church, and Admission to the Eucharist in the Letters and the *De Lapsis* of Cyprian of Carthage" (PhD diss., Catholic University of America, 1980), 109–112. Cyprian of Carthage, *De lapsis* 5, ed. M. Bévenot, CCSL 3:223: "Dominus probari familiam suam voluit; et quia traditam nobis divinitus disciplinam *pax* longa corruperat, iacentem fidem et paene dixerim dormientem censura caelestis erexit."

13. *De lapsis* 15, 229: "Contra Domini ac Dei legem temeritate quorundam laxatur incautis communicatio: inrita et falsa pax, periculosa dantibus et nihil accipientibus profutura."

It was a training ground for future soldiers, whose defining quality was their obedience to an established and singular church hierarchy. Within this encampment resided true peace, guarded by correctly administered sacraments of baptism, penance, and communion.

The suspicions of peace that Cyprian raised during the imperial persecutions of the mid-third century would emerge in new forms after empire embraced church in the fourth and fifth. Both he and Augustine had left medieval church reformers a language with which to denounce willing captivity in a world of powers and principalities. However, ideas do not float unattached, to be conveniently snatched up for future use. They carry their context with them and impose this context on those who appropriate ideas anew. Arguably, what is being appropriated is not the idea itself but rather the historical circumstance to which the idea gives expression. In the eleventh century, churchmen who turned to Cyprian saw themselves living through a new imperial persecution, soothed by a gentle yoke that seemed to be divinely mandated but was actually diabolical.

In its medieval form, the friendship between church and Roman Empire was a false peace; it rivaled in destructiveness Adam's submission to Eve and the serpent. The church had slept, a behemoth in the swamp, enjoying a torpidity of spirit that put Christians on the brink of destruction. Conflict therefore became an essential component of peacemaking, a turbulent and constant displacement of false peace for the sake of true. Civil wars and insurrections, despoiled churches and dishonored sacraments, were all stings of compunction, arriving just in time to rouse the church from its ignominious slumber. In the wake of new calls for reform, to reject false peace in the pursuit of true became the task of the Christian soldier.

Making and Faking Peace between 1000 and 1200

In the early eleventh century, in the name of peace, a small group of Frankish bishops, monks, and lay supporters embarked on the liberation of the church and amelioration of society. I cannot subscribe with any great enthusiasm to a master narrative that insists these calls for peace were responses to social anarchy, or that this period (indisputably bereft of formal institutions) was more "violent" than those before or after. I do, however, see the ensuing century as a time of large-scale transformations in ideas and self-fashioning. In 1024, the first Salian monarch, Conrad II, was crowned emperor, and Gerard of Cambrai rearticulated the now-famous Carolingian model of Three Orders. Churchmen began to show detailed interest in violence and

peacemaking, haranguing their congregations to desist from infringement on the rights of churches. They attended assemblies of the Peace of God (the largest Peace of God council was held in 1024), and supported imperial attempts to restore order in the papacy. In the broadest terms, identified by Georges Duby, Marie-Dominique Chenu, and others, these monks, bishops, and priests envisioned themselves as a single profession distinguished from the laity.[14] With this insistence on distinct identity came a concomitant awareness of overlap, boundary crossing, and interpenetration of modes of living, in short a discourse imbued with imitation and "mimicry": and hence, the fear of a "falsified" peace.

As had been the case with Cyprian, false peace manifested itself most clearly in the misappropriation of sacraments. After 1049, the "reform popes," Leo IX, Nicholas II, Alexander II, Gregory VII, Urban II, and Paschal II, espoused an aggressive policy to expand clerical authority and eradicate simony and clerical concubinage. At the heart of the reform movement was a deep-seated fear of illicit sacraments, masses tainted by priests who had bought their ordinations with bribes. Many feared that in response to sinful clerics, the sacramental materials would refuse to transform, leaving worshippers with only bread, wine, and a commitment of faith to a false prophet. Simony, or the buying and selling of the Holy Spirit, became the most visible form of this abuse of sacraments. Along with a bribe, a simoniac gave an oath of loyalty (*sacramentum*) to the person who gave him his office. Paying the sin forward, he then conferred sacraments (*sacramenta*) on a congregation that acknowledged him as their entry point into the community of Christ. The Salian and Ottonian emperors relied on such dissemination of church offices for control of their vast territories and tributaries, a form of rulership through friendship.[15] Pope Gregory VII attacked the foundation of these friendships as bad sacraments, and so denied the rulers the obedience of their subjects. Solicitude for the integrity of church sacraments was thus subsumed into a larger critique of fidelities. False sacraments generated wicked communities held together by parodies of authentic peace.

Even as this battle played itself out in polemic between empire and papacy, monks and canons with their own ambitions of reform had begun to explore

14. Georges Duby, "The Laity and the Peace of God," *The Chivalrous Society*, trans. Cynthia Postan (Berkeley, 1977), 123–133; Chenu, "Monks, Canons, and Laymen," 202–238.

15. Gerd Althoff, *Family, Friends, and Followers: Political and Social Bonds in Medieval Europe*, trans. Christopher Carroll (Cambridge, 2004; Ger. orig. 1990), 121–135.

the pernicious nature of false peace, and to delineate the forceful methods by which false peace should be transformed into true. Like Ezekiel, who had sketched peace on a tile and watched as it became a call to battle, many reformers felt torn between a desire to rebel against unjust rulers and the fear of betraying divinely constituted oaths. They redefined peace in terms of these concerns, making love of true peace the rationale for legitimate obedience and necessary insurrection. In the process, they generated fears of a mirror image: violence clothed in tranquility, stability, and acquiescence. A creature of this world, such a concord offered no guide to authentic peace, only an indication of its absence or distortion.

Mimicry conveys aspirations as well as dangers. It can signal the prospect of amelioration to the good, modeling the best or most useful as a means to improvement.[16] Hence Gregory the Great's advice to pastors to learn from the world and take on the weakness of the weak, the framework of ecclesiastical harmony in the twelfth-century *Book of Orders and Professions*.[17] Twelfth-century authors like Hugh of Saint-Victor and Gerhoh of Reichersberg set great store by images of ascendance that Christians could fix in their minds (hearts) and thus be drawn up through a form of mimetic affinity.[18] In these cases, modeling should include recognition that identity is unobtainable; imitation was benign in its reiteration of difference. Read as parody, however, mimicry signaled implacable opposition on the one hand and unacceptable transgression of boundaries on the other, that is to say, violence. For Tertullian, the Roman army "mimicked Christian martyrdom," down to its espousal of wreaths and sacraments.[19] It did not matter who had originated these gestures, the assertion of mimicry implied an opposition between the real and the false; it carried the danger of seduction and distortion of truth. Overwhelmed by Satan, the world mimicked the Christian encampment for Tertullian, whereas for Hippolytus of Rome, bellicose pagan

16. Cf. 1 Cor. 4.16: "Be ye followers of me, as I also am of Christ," translated in the King James Version as "Imitate me, just as I also imitate Christ." And see Morrison, *Mimetic Tradition of Reform*, 69.

17. *LDO*, 20: "ut infirmis facti infirmi infirmos lucrentur." Gregory, *Reg. past.* 2.5, 32B-C: "Sit rector singulis compassione proximus, prae cunctis contemplatione suspensus, ut et per pietatis viscera in se infirmitatem caeterorum transferat." See Carole Straw, *Gregory the Great: Perfection in Imperfection* (Berkeley, 1988), 90–93.

18. For a discussion of twelfth-century images of ascension, see below, chapter 6.

19. On Tertullian's representation of Christian-Roman oppositions, see Adolf Harnack, *"Militia Christi": The Christian Religion and the Military in the First Three Centuries*, trans. David M. Gracie (Philadelphia, 1981; Ger. orig. 1905; repr., 1963), 53–54.

society mimicked the peace of the Christian bond, in turn redirecting the church's opposition to the world along the lines of militarism.[20] If churchmen were to take seriously Gregory's exhortations to mirror the world in order to transform it, then they needed extraordinary discernment not to lose their own image in the process.[21]

In a world folded upon itself,[22] peace had shadows and mirror images, some of them faithful approximations, but many, seditious distortions of the original. Mimicry of peace was especially dangerous, because it produced forms of community that looked harmless, even beneficial: it was violence in its extreme form, imperceptible and therefore most coercive and manipulative. Thus, a communion offered by disobedient or abusive priests actually created a concord of the damned, where unbeknownst to the congregation, chains of carnal affection and mercenary friendship replaced the bonds of peace. To churchmen of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, such diabolical communion could take several forms: heresies and schisms most recognizably, but also lay investiture of unworthy prelates and urban oath collectives known as communes. While several of these presented as associations founded on mutual peace and concord, they were actually engines of war. Often, only discord would reveal their true, violent nature, and for this reason purveyors of true peace must not hesitate to embrace conflict.[23]

---

20. Hippolytus of Rome, *Commentaire sur Daniel* 2.27–29, ed. Maurice Lefèvre, Sources Chrétiennes 14 (Paris, 1947), 167–175, conveys an early Christian understanding of the Roman Empire as a world transformed into an engine of war. The sole purpose of the Roman as opposed to the Christian social bond is the propagation of conflict. Militarism is therefore imposed on the church, by its organization against the demands of empire and by the peace it must craft within a system devoted to warfare. I thank Brett Whalen for the reference and discussion.

21. On mimicry in a constantly shifting discourse of otherness, see Homi K. Bhabha, "Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse," reprinted in *The Location of Culture* (London, 1994), 85–92. James Ferguson, "Of Mimicry and Membership: Africans and the 'New World Society,'" in *Global Shadows: Africa in the Neoliberal World Order* (Durham, NC, 2006), 155–175, explores anthropological studies that expand mimicry beyond a problematic colonial discourse of amelioration to one fraught with dangers of parody, reappropriation, and defiance of hegemonic representations of elite (here Western) exceptionalism. I thank Kathryn Mathers for the reference. On the terrifying prospect of captivation and reversal through replication, see Michael Taussig, *Mimesis and Alterity: A Particular History of the Senses* (New York, 1993).

22. I have borrowed this image from Michel Foucault's *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (New York, 1994; Fr. orig. 1966), 17.

23. Gregory the Great advises peacemakers not to love peace so much that they hesitate to disrupt it for the purpose of correction. *Reg. past.* 3.22, 90C-91C.

Conflicting Visions and Visions of Conflict

When modern historians discuss notions of peace in the Middle Ages, they focus on those who had the loudest voices, not those who (to paraphrase Richard Southern) hid from the world and spoke to a very few.[24] For example, Ernst-Dieter Hehl's treatment of peace in the *New Cambridge Medieval History* discusses the Peace of God movement, the papal-imperial conflict (or "Investiture Controversy"), and the declaration of the First Crusade, and then jumps to canon law and political theory from the middle of the twelfth century. However, what happened between 1095 and 1150 is equally important, yet ignored for its intangibility and lack of definition. During a period of relative quiet in the struggle between popes and emperors, monks and secular clergymen were discussing free will, spiritual conversion, and sacramental efficacy in relation to the legitimacy of kingdoms and communities, unifying all under the rubric of true peacemaking. These "protoscholastic" conceptions of peace appear in scholarly exegesis of key passages in Genesis, the Gospel of John, and the synoptic Gospels, especially Matthew. Authentic peace began as a correct sequence of tastes, responses, and desires that then directed love toward appropriate objects, ultimately producing genuine community. The sacrament of communion exemplified such peace, as it absorbed Christians in the ideal community, the body of Christ. Theological and exegetical treatments of peace translated to several levels of the church, presumably even reaching the laity via clerical preparation for the sermon.[25] Iconic political discussions of peace in Gratian's *Decretum*, John of Salisbury's *Policraticus*, and Rufinus of Sorrento's *De bono pacis* are ultimately standardizations of a wide-ranging and often messy discussion of peace conducted before 1150.

Discussions of peace during the eleventh and twelfth centuries added up to a thoroughgoing critique of fidelities, an attempt to monopolize and rationalize human commitment and loyalty. But the demands of the church's peace went deeper than fidelities had gone previously, targeting a transformation of self that liberated the spirit and redirected the flesh to conform to divine will. As makers and keepers of the peace, reformers looked with

24. R. W. Southern, *The Making of the Middle Ages* (New Haven, CT, 1953), 13.

25. Preaching manuals provided new preachers with a number of topics appropriate for the sermon; peace is one of them. Alan of Lille's *Ars praedicandi* consults multiple scriptural authorities as well as Gregory the Great and Seneca to provide a brief treatment for novice preachers on peace. See Alan, *Summa de arte praedicatoria* 22, PL 210:155D-157C.

suspicion on the manner in which other loyalties formed, the nature of the oath that created the bond, its implications for relationships with those outside the bond, and the motivations and affections that held persons together in the community. In this respect, the sworn commune became a perversion, even though both religious and lay princes in western Europe employed communal oaths to their political advantage. In theory, the communal oath mimicked regular as well as secular vows, undermining loyalties to church and kingdom. In practice, however, this was not an issue until fighting broke out between competing urban authorities and the commune. The fraudulent oath collective then appeared as an indictment of the bishop or lord who had sanctioned it in the first place: a disorderly conspiracy that was merely the epiphenomenon of a deeper and more pervasive violence.

That we study peace here and not fidelity should not minimize the role of the latter in the sociopolitical discourse of the High Middle Ages.[26] However, one does not find the term *fides* deployed as *pax* was, as both a claim over the love of others and a marker of their willing and complete transformation. We do not read about "Faith of God" movements in the eleventh century. Communes like the Paix de Valenciennes did not represent themselves as the Faith of such-and-such city but instead as its Peace; their members were "men of [the] peace." Finally, it is peace that reveals how educated clergymen (and clerically trained scholars) emplotted aggression, retaliation, rebellion, and coercion within narratives of sociopolitical reform and religious conversion alike.

While medieval intellectuals read conflict as they would text, they also wrote about it in stylized ways that conformed to their notion of how fighting disclosed latent violence: for example, the misrule of an illicit bishop or the disobedience of a commune. Stories of evangelical activity developed similar images of inherently violent lay communities, whose own methods of dispute settlement were pugnacious and mercenary—and thus a marker of religious lapse. Monks and priests conveyed peace here as they would offer a sacrament, judging its effectiveness by the willingness of laypersons to change their modes of social ordering.

The ideals of peace sanctioned the clerical enterprise of the twelfth century, including the use of secular instruments such as military force and ostentatious displays of wealth. In pagan lands, missionaries provoked ducal

26. See, for example, Thomas Bisson, *The Crisis of the Twelfth Century: Power, Lordship, and the Origins of European Government* (Princeton, NJ, 2009), in which the author constructs a narrative of twelfth-century tranformation in the West around crises of fidelity.

military power to intervene, forcing a confrontation with locals before offering Christianity as a condition of peace. Monks and canons debating the role of the *vita activa* found answers in the peace exemplified by Christ's body, where some clerics must work in the world to relay its signs to the inside, for interpretation and decision making. More ambitiously, at the end of the twelfth century, the canonist Rufinus of Sorrento determined that even while ideal peace could not be achieved on earth, the clergy must take primary responsibility for the administration of an imperfect peace, the sociopolitical peace of Babylon, in which domination and political authority took the place of love and willing obedience.

The self-described peacemaker therefore took on specific tasks, not all of which conform to a modern, normative understanding of peace: to discipline one's own tastes in order to differentiate true peace from its mirrors; to convey peace to outsiders despite the dangers of worldly taint; to disrupt normatively tranquil communities and kingdoms in order to produce the revolution in tastes and affections necessary for true peace. These criteria of peacemaking enabled churchmen to construct the church as a spiritual institution that could, without compromise, still make peace with a social and political world.

The immensity of clerical ambitions for peace contributed to their ultimate failure. By the end of the fourteenth century, critics of the papacy like Marsilius argued that churchmen should not be making peace with the world. At the same time, secular monarchies began to appropriate clerical visions of peace, giving themselves an exclusive mandate to demand the love of subjects, and sanctioning the use of force and conflict for the purpose of securing an authentic internal transformation. The state as we know it today emerged not in reaction to a lack of peace in the Middle Ages but rather to an overabundance of concerns for its definition.

Understanding Peace and Violence in Medieval Christian Texts

Any study of peace proves difficult without a proper understanding of how the word was used and avoided in medieval speech. In this book I consciously challenge treatments of peace and violence that use these terms cavalierly, and without consideration for semantic archaeology. Casual usage has produced numerous incorrect assumptions about peace that, in turn, structure the way we read medieval accounts of fighting and conflict resolution. In modern parlance, when peacemaking involves the use of force, especially arms, only two interpretations are possible: either there has been a "slippage" in pacifist

ideals or there has been a deliberate abatement of peace (temporarily, one hopes) in the interest of achieving it in the future. These poles of interpretation (hypocrisy or end justifying means) have been imposed carelessly on the Middle Ages. Insights from anthropology have provided important correctives while relying on an assumption that conflict was ingrained in the medieval social process. While a reasonable assessment, this still leaves unanswered the obvious question: Why were medieval writers so diligent about recording conflict if in fact it was so mundane?

I suggest we begin by considering peace as scholars in the Augustinian tradition did: as an ideal form that on earth manifests itself as approximations of reality. These approximations may include terror, coercion, and fighting. From this Neoplatonist standpoint, peace and conflict may inhabit the same system: two cities entwined for the earthly age. Taking a cue from Augustine, peace is never absent; it is present in all things but often distorted, subverted, or disguised. Even the wicked have peace of a kind, much like an upside-down object that remains stable regardless of the fact that it is directed the wrong way.[27] More troublesome, even, in this world where all creatures have peace, no creatures truly do. True peace, the eternal peace of celestial Jerusalem, eludes humanity, so that in those who recognize its absence a restlessness and yearning directs them to search and, always failing, to rely on divine mercy. For both the historian of medieval social process and the scholar of Augustine's legacy to medieval Christianity, earthly peace is thus an "uncertain boon," illusory, problematic, indistinguishable from conflict, simultaneously everywhere one looks and yet nowhere to be found.[28]

As patristic and high medieval thinkers in the Neoplatonist, Augustinian tradition expressed it, the relic of peace on earth should be seamless consonance among divine will, the directives of government, and the delighted compliance of subjects: liberation of the will through a realignment of human desires. But while accepted as a positive presence rather than a mere absence of fighting, peace rarely conveyed the same set of meanings to would-be peacekeepers, and thus identification of the true peace acquired paramount importance. In his treatise on peace Rufinus resolved its dual condition of stability and variability by arguing that peace—*Pax*—meant the Trinity, a universal that contained not only the blessed peace of angels but also the categories of human and diabolical peace.[29] His attempted resolution comes,

27. Augustine, *De civ.* 19.12, 390–394.

28. Augustine, *De civ.* 19.5, 380.

29. *DBP* 1.1, 52–56.

however, at the end of a frenetic period (1000–1200) in which those who claimed to make peace also insisted on monopolizing its meaning.

In the medieval Christian tradition, recognition of an ontologically stable peace (either "true" or "false" but always present) distinguishes it from "violence": violence is a modifier of situations and actions, a distortion/reversal of peace, and consistently negative. We encounter *violenter*, the abverb, as often as *violentia*. Medieval accusations of violence refer to betrayal of oaths, usurpation of authority, trespass, the inhibition of another's will, and the distortion of love. Violence thus characterized actions but was not itself an action: instead it denoted the moral valence of a power relationship. To use force "violently" put one beyond the pale. A benevolent exception is the famous *pia violentia*, prayers whose violence would "storm heaven."[30] In his *Commentaries on Ezekiel*, Jerome describes the storming of heaven as a "holy violence" (*sancta violentia*), but even in this case the usage of *violentia* suggests a virtual coercion of the deity himself and must be carefully parsed.[31] This is not to say that *violentia* or its derivatives *violens* and *violenter* were always used for accusation: Arnulf of Milan, although sparing in his use of the term, does refer to "violent" winds.[32] Recounting the papacy of Alexander III, Cardinal Boso speaks of the Greek emperor Manuel's "violent" incursions into the territory of the Turkish sultan—but even in this case, the label of violence opens a moral fable on Manuel's unwillingness to make peace with his enemies, which results in a humiliating defeat.[33] What we do say about the different registers of peace and violence is that since peace had an ideal existence out of time, it could always be said to exist in some form, be it approximation or parody. Violence, on the other hand, implied its own limitations, situational and interpersonal—if not a state of exception then at least an exceptional state; the devil's invasion of the world had caused that exceptional state to be of extended duration, hence the need for coercion and, as high medieval

30. "Pia violentia, qua regnum coeleste rapitur." The Cistercian Guerric of Igny meditates on this "violence" by which persons come before Christ not just by invitation but also through a vehemence of the heart that forces them on him: "Spiritus enim ante faciem nostram Christus Dominus, non modo invitandus, sed et attrabendus quadam violentia precis, vehementiaque fervoris in hospitium cordis." It is "praiseworthy rudeness" (*laudabilis importunitas*), he says. Guerric, *Sermones per annum* 3.3, PL 185:20B-C. I thank Philippe Buc for pointing out this usage. Cf. Matt. 11.12.

31. Jerome, *Commentariorum in Hiezechielem Libri IV* 6.18, ed. F. Gloria, CCSL 75:237–238.

32. Arnulf of Milan, *Liber gestorum recentium* 4.8, ed. Claudia Zey, MGH SSrGs 62:213, here with reference to the "violence of winds" with which a fire raged through Milan. Even in this case, however, the populace blamed the Patarene rebel leader Erlembald both for the fire and for the "violence" of degrading the sacraments. See below, chapter 3.

33. Boso, *Vita Alexandri*, ed. J. M. Watterich, in *Pont. Rom.* 2, no. 6: 434–435.

reformers would insist, for struggle.[34] Imagine a usurped kingdom, then, where the basic state of liberty, still present as a goal, remains impeded to the point of silence by unjust domination, and where warfare as an instrument of liberation provides the antidote to static (but nonetheless "violent") captivity.

Once considered the antidote to this extreme, inexpressible violence, warfare is treated today as its synonym, and as its temporal bracket.[35] Probably as a result of this association, in modern usage violence has become objectively quantifiable, while possessing what Daniel Baraz dubs "moral neutrality."[36] Today one is judged by the conduct and justification for violence, whereas in the Middle Ages to talk of *violentia* put actions or relationships in the realm of the wrong: delusion and contravention of justice. With the narrowing of categories for violence, the medieval Christian concept may now be found buried in ideologies that, while atheist or agnostic, share the revolutionary imperative of the religion. A term used by socialist political scientists in the 1970s, "structural violence" best captures the medieval usage of the term as a description of unjust power relationships and inhibitions of another's will through either domination or deceit. One might also make the argument that "liberation theology" with its invocation of Exodus perceives violence structurally, as captivity within "pharaonic" regimes of global capitalism and social injustice.

Peace, of course, is not a peculiarly Christian concern. Regular considerations of peace appear in other offshoots of the Abrahamic tradition. The Old Testament covenant with God was at once a war pact and a guarantee of peace between God and humanity. While Christians understood its realization in the coming of Christ, in the Judeo-Christian tradition as a whole the chosen people are all protected by a divine promise that in exchange for exclusive devotion and warfare on his behalf, God will bring peace to the tents of Israel. Islam, an Abrahamic religion named for submission and passivity before God, also makes peace a boundary of the faith: the house of peace and the house of war make up the divisions of the world within and outside. Early Christians expressed their religion with much the same, militaristic

34. Cf. Gregory, *Moralia in Job* 25.16.34, ed. Marcus Adriaen, CCSL 143B:1260, on Hos. 13.11: "I will give you a king in my anger."

35. On the temporal localization of "war" in American legal approaches, see Mary L. Dudziak, "Law, War, and the History of Time," *California Law Review* 98 (Oct. 2010): 1669–1712. Dudziak applies assumptions of warfare as its own time to arguments (e.g., Georgio Agamben's) regarding warfare as a state of exception. Norman Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium* (Fairlawn, NJ, 1957), is in many ways the precursor of such an approach.

36. Daniel Baraz, *Medieval Cruelty: Changing Perceptions, Late Antiquity to the Early Modern Period* (Ithaca, NY, 2003), 6–7.

imagery: the church was an encampment that must be guarded not just against the world's aggression but also against its offers of peace.

Both Islam and Christianity faced questions about how to expand the boundaries of their religion while still maintaining an acceptable peace. While the early political conquests of Islamic kingdoms enabled Muslims to offer peace as a form of political accommodation to people of the book (Jews, Christians, and sometimes Zoroastrians), this was not as easy for Christians, who lacked political and military power in their early centuries. Tertullian dreamed of a dramatic expansion of the church before the end of time, but he also expected the end to come very soon, so that the boundaries of peace would reach their fullest compass only in the death of the world. Expansion that took place on earth did so as drops of Christian blood, drops to be shed without retaliation, but to be matched hundredfold in the death of persecutors at the end of time.[37]

When the world, or Roman Empire, refused to die and instead extended its life by gradually becoming Christian between 313 and 380, the church faced new problems regarding its peace. The abstract universalism of the heavenly kingdom now had to coexist with the concrete expansionist policies of Rome. It was no longer realistic to expect a Christian peace separate from *Pax Romana*, which entailed armed defense of territory, culture, and citizens and strict disciplining of dissenters.[38] While political concord and religious accommodation had allowed the militarism of the Roman peace to be manageable, the demands of peace in the Christian tradition were more rigorous, implacable, intrusive, and aggressive. The greatest roadblock was a disjuncture within the command to offer love to all neighbors while still drawing them into the peace of the church: should they be brought against their will, and if so, how?

Through a self-inflicted schizophrenia, Christians found themselves using political and military weapons to consolidate a religion that continued to define itself through rejection of the world. Christian thinkers contented themselves with the knowledge that God had given them kings to engage the bloody politics of the present, even as priests disseminated God's charity and mercy in preparation for the world to come. Thus a political peace, governed by feuds, time-sensitive pacts, rehearsed betrayals, strategic anger, and the choreography of vengeance developed side by side with an ideal of otherworldly

37. Most famously, Tertullian, *Apologeticum* 50.13.60, ed. E. Dekkers, CCSL 1:171: "Semen est sanguis Christianorum!" Also see Lactantius, *De mortibus persecutorum* 1.3, ed. J. L. Creed (Oxford, 1984), 4.

38. Harnack, *Militia Christi*, 65–105, discusses the dilemmas facing Christian soldiers in the Roman military engine of imperial defense and expansion.

peace: faith in eternal life, renunciation of sex and concupiscence, collective ownership of property, personal discipline, and graded separation from mammon. There remained considerable overlap between these two modes of peace, but with only infrequent discussion of mutual exclusivity before the eleventh century. The early decades of the eleventh century are thus the starting point for this exploration of medieval experiments with peace.

CHAPTER 1

Revising Peace

Reform and the Millennium

In August 1023, on the banks of the Meuse in Alsace-Lorraine, the two preeminent Christian monarchs of the West made a great gesture toward achieving God's peace on earth. Emperor Henry II and King Robert the Pious of France "concluded a statement of peace and justice and a reconciliation of mutual friendship."[1] The *Deeds of the Bishops of Cambrai* lauds this moment of peacemaking and contrasts it to the many counterfeits of peace then prevalent, including the Peace of God movement then popular in central France. Peace, however, had been declared too soon. The chronicler goes on to describe the subsequent betrayal of blessed peace, and an onslaught of reactionary evil forces on a world that was not yet ready for it. In response to this setback, the hero of the *Deeds*, Bishop Gerard of Cambrai would voice new conceptions of the church's peace while on earth.

1. *Gesta episcoporum Cameracensium* 3.37, MGH SS 7:480: "Ibi certe pacis et iusticiae summa diffinitio mutuaeque amicitiae facta reconciliatio." See the events discussed in Georges Duby, *The Three Orders: Feudal Society Imagined*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Chicago, 1980; Fr. orig., Paris, 1978), 24–29; Robert M. Stein, "Sacred Authority and Secular Power: The Historical Argument of the *Gesta episcoporum Cameracensium*," in *Sacred and Secular in Medieval and Early Modern Cultures: New Essays*, ed. Lawrence Besserman (New York, 2006), 149–166; and briefly (on counterfeit peace) in T. M. Riches, "Bishop Gerard I of Cambrai-Arras, the Three Orders, and the Problem of Human Weakness," in *The Bishop Reformed: Studies of Episcopal Power and Culture in the Central Middle Ages*, ed. John S. Ott and Anna E. Trumbore (Aldershot, UK, 2007), 126–128.

One of several churchmen to pronounce on the peace and violence of their time, Gerard exemplifies a growing obsession with the meaning of peace during the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

Revisitations of the meaning of peace became the vehicle for clerical self-fashioning in the Latin West, when churchmen asserted the general social utility of their sacraments, preaching, and leadership. Experiments with peace shaped novel clerical modes, from papal monarchism to monastic proselytism. In southern and central France, visions of peace formed under the auspices of the great abbey of Cluny and the Peace of God movement. To the north, bishops and abbots brought a very different peace to Flemish and Lotharingian churches. Yet obsessions with peace emerged alongside a paradox that clergymen faced in the eleventh century. On the one hand, they had now constituted themselves as a single order, distinct from the laity, that would in imitation of early Christians renounce weapons and sexual relationships. On the other, these churchmen had aspirations to reform both clerical *and* lay consciences, even through lordship and physical force. Thus, despite their constitution as a separate profession, churchmen had undertaken to export their own vision of peace to laypersons, and to supplant their misguided social intercourse with clerical modes of obedience and living.

The concerns expressed in the making of this peace have given historians an anarchic picture of the millennium: apocalyptic hysteria and a crisis in fidelities and social order. Although this millennial transformation may be exaggerated, the images of peacemaking and violence that produced the distortion cannot be ignored. They expose a feverish and multipronged debate about true peace and the dangers of its parodies. This chapter describes the renewal of aspirations for an authentic peace among churchmen on the interface of church and world, and their early experiments with bringing Jerusalem, the vision of peace, to earth. By examining representations of the new millennium's paradigmatic peacemakers, I will explore the extent of these clerical aspirations.

Disputing Millennial Violence

In Richard Southern's evocative phrase, the eleventh-century Angevin warlord Fulk Nerra exhibited a personality that alternated "between headlong violence [and] abrupt acts of remorse and atonement."[2] To Southern,

2. R. W. Southern, *The Making of the Middle Ages* (New Haven, CT, 1953), 86.

Marc Bloch, and a generation of historians in the early part of the twentieth century, men like Fulk represent the mental instability of a post-Carolingian fighting class in western Francia. To historians like J.-F. Lemarignier, Pierre Bonnassie, Jean-Pierre Poly, Eric Bournazel, and Thomas Bisson, the rise of a Fulk marks the culmination of the "crisis of fidelity" that produced social and political turmoil at the end of the first millennium.[3] Neither of these descriptions reliably presents sociopolitical conditions in the eleventh-century West. One is static and essentialist, while the other relies too much on an anachronistic equation of conflict, violence, and anarchy for its picture of millennial catastrophe and rebuilding.

Sources from the period suggest more complicated changes, discursive more than political, transformations in the social aspirations of clerical witnesses rather than testimonies of terror. The chronicler Raoul Glaber, who speaks loudest for a millennial rupture, indeed dwells on Fulk's destructive tendencies, including his aversion to peace. Yet this same Glaber also acknowledges Fulk's role in bringing peace to his tributaries, and the anonymous author of the Chronicles of Anjou remarks that peace lasted only as long as Count Fulk was alive.[4] Such tension between a brutalized peace and

3. Marc Bloch, *Feudal Society*, trans. L.A. Manyon (Chicago, 1961; Fr. orig. 1939–40), esp. 1:190–279 and 2:394–420. In "From Peace to Power: The Study of Disputes in Medieval France," in *Medieval Transformations: Texts, Power, and Gifts in Context*, ed. Esther Cohen and Mayke de Jong (Leiden, 2001), 205–207, Stephen D. White argues that Marc Bloch's description in *Feudal Society* of a medieval social system centered on violence mutated in the hands of subsequent generations of scholars into an image of post-Carolingian anarchy. Subsequent (erroneous) treatments of the period see in Bloch's description evidence of anarchy brought about by the collapse of Charlemagne's empire and invasions from Saracens and Vikings. See Guy Bois, *The Transformation of the Year 1000: The Village of Lournand from Antiquity to Feudalism*, trans. Jean Birrel (Manchester, 1992); and a rebuttal by Dominique Barthélemy, *La mutation de l'an mil a-t-elle eu lieu? Servage et chevalerie dans la France de x^e^ et xi^e^ siècles* (Paris, 1997), published in English as *The Serf, the Knight, and the Historian* (see below). Using chronological boundaries posited by Bloch, Jean-Pierre Poly and Eric Bournazel have articulated divisions between a first and a second "feudal age" based on the breakdown of centralized authority. Jean-Pierre Poly and Eric Bournazel, *The Feudal Transformation: 900–1200*, trans. Caroline Higgitt, Europe Past and Present Series (New York, 1991); French original: *La mutation féodale, x^e^–xii^e^ siècles* (Paris, 1980). Adjustments of the devolution model favor new kinds of social and political growth over collapse: social violence was not anarchy but the birth pangs of a new and coercive feudal society. See Thomas N. Bisson, "The 'Feudal Revolution,'" *Past and Present* 142 (Feb. 1994): 6–42. Bisson's comprehensive *The Crisis of the Twelfth Century: Power, Lordship, and the Origins of European government* (Princeton, NJ, 2009) presupposes a master narrative of millennial rupture, although he locates the brutalism of a new feudal age around 1100.

4. R. Glaber, *Historiarum libri quinque; Rodulphus Glaber, The Five Books of Histories*, trans. J. France (Oxford, 1989), 158 (henceforth Glaber, *Histories*). *Chronica de gestis consulum Andegavorum*, ed. Paul Marchegay and Emile Mabille (Paris, 1856), 1:117: "Itaque terra usque ad obitum Fulconis in pace siluit."

necessary warfare tells us how churchmen imagined a bellicose world that they then committed themselves to transform.

A review of problematic but enduring master narratives helps establish what did and did not change around the millennium. For those who subscribe to the notion of millennial violence its roots were the empowerment and subsequent collapse of late Carolingian territorial principalities or *pagi* by 900 and the concomitant spread of peasant "unfreedom." In France and Catalonia, this meant the disappearance of the peasant freehold (or *allod*) and replacement of mutual contracts of protection and service by a one-sided, quasi-familial dependence activated by a lord's gift of land, or else by landed income that eventually became a payment for service (fee). Power became both decentralized and personalized as the *bannum*, a prerogative of justice and domination that Charlemagne had sought to reserve for the king and his men, was now transferred to wealthy landholding freemen, caretakers of small castles, and individual churches. The spiritual bonds of homage and benefit that had once applied only to the monarchy now became a commonplace of tangled, local clientage networks.[5] The "devolution" process was the antithesis of state formation, if state is taken to mean a centralized adjudicating authority. For historians of the state, anarchy reigned between 900 and 1100, before the trappings of civilization—to wit, bureaucracy, personal liberty, and classical culture—gradually returned to western Europe.

According to this narrative of disorder, violence, and reprisal, from the late ninth century, Carolingian royal authority had gradually shifted to the rulers of the *pagi*.[6] After 1000, the military began to organize on an even smaller scale; its unit was the *castrum*, a stronghold held nominally by the territorial lord but eventually taken over by its caretaker, who was sometimes known as *castellanus*.[7] In the eleventh and twelfth centuries, these castellans began to pursue "banal lordship," a predatory form of local domination that flourished as the *pagus* declined.[8] The resultant violence produced a reactionary

5. Georges Duby's studies of medieval dispute resolution in the Maconnais undergird recent arguments regarding millennial rupture. Around 1000, Duby argues, Carolingian public courts gave way to informal mechanisms of compromise, and contracts gave way to oaths as binding instruments. The lord's justice was not concerned with general welfare but with personal profit. See Duby, "The Evolution of Judicial Institutions," *The Chivalrous Society*, trans. Cynthia Postan (Berkeley, 1977), 15–58.

6. Poly and Bournazel, *Feudal Transformation*, 17.

7. Ibid., 27–28.

8. Ibid., 34–38.

religious reform driven by movements such as the Peace of God, and subsequently by the Gregorian reformers.[9] According to Thomas Bisson, new notions of government developed out of these responses to the violence of postmutation western Europe. The years after 1100 saw a more intensified and pervasive form of repressive lordship; sources from the Languedoc, Aquitaine, and Catalonia suggest that disparate violence coalesced into administrative structures: a centralized bureaucracy and a persecuting society had begun to form by the twelfth century.[10]

A model of rupture and repression *seems* to explain why churchmen started to discuss peace and its exceptions so energetically around 1000. But can millennial accounts of violence be taken at face value? Since the 1980s, critics of "mutationism" have pointed out that a period without public justice is not necessarily an anarchic period, and that the label "violence" disparages conflict's role in arbitrations that ran outside or parallel to formal judicial proceedings.[11] But even those who refuse to label it anarchic argue that conflict was everywhere; it had become part of a social structure for dispute resolutions based on "shared values and implicit rules" that took the place of public law courts.[12]

If conflict was so quotidian and ingrained, why did eleventh-century authors feel the need to describe it in detail? A simple explanation for clerical authors' interest in eleventh-century fighting is the same one that has been given—and recently rejected—for the church's interest in heresy during the

9. Pierre Bonnassie, *La Catalogne du milieu du Xe à la fin du XIe siècle: Croissance et mutations d'une société*, vols. 1 and 2 (Toulouse, 1975). Inspired by Duby's chronology, Christian Lauranson-Rosaz, "Peace from the Mountains: On the Auvergnat Origins of the Peace of God," in *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000*, ed. Thomas Head and Richard Landes (Ithaca, NY, 1992), 104–134, describes the Peace of God movement as a populist response to millennial social anarchy in the Massif Centrale.

10. See the arguments of Bonnassie and Bisson cited above, notes 4 and 10. R. I. Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 2007; orig. 1987), relies on this narrative of violent state formation after 1100.

11. On conflict as social process, Fredric L. Cheyette, "Suum cuique tribuere," *French Historical Studies* 6 (1970): 287–299; and Stephen D. White, "'Pactum . . . legem vincit et amor judicium': The Settlement of Disputes by Compromise in Eleventh-Century Western France," *American Journal of Legal History* 22 (1978): 281–309. See also Patrick J. Geary, "Living with Conflict in Stateless France," trans. and repr. in *Living with the Dead in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY, 1994), 145–159. As White has pointed out, appellations like violence tend to cause more confusion than they help resolve. White, "The 'Feudal Revolution'" (II), *Past and Present* 152 (Aug. 1996): 206–207.

12. Geary, "Living with Conflict," 145.

twelfth century: there was just so much of it.[13] But read closely, conflict narratives from the eleventh century display more than an ordinary desire to record and bemoan post-Carolingian chaos. Instead, violence appears juxtaposed to certain standards of peace seemingly remote from the sphere of quarrel and mediation. There is an emphasis on the rightful authority of those in charge of peacemaking, on the operation of grace and its genuine acceptance, on the necessity for clerical supervision of peacemaking, and on the perpetuity of the peace that has been made. A temporary alliance or politic truce is not peace.

In a world where peace was more palpable when limited to three or five years it would gradually be spoken of in terms of eternity—without irony or suspicion.[14] Where once it was instrumental, now it was exalted, a valorizing condition, not just a respite from fighting. Violence as the antithesis of this form of peace need not even refer to actual activity. To invade a monastery or hold a diocese by violence might mean simply to rule the latter without canonical authority or to reform the former without the monks' consent: in effect to claim prerogatives of leadership illegitimately.

Calls for peace were statements of redefinition, the production of new roles and responsibilities for churchmen and laypersons. New social and religious roles for clergy emerged in southern and central France at the end of the tenth century via a set of peace assemblies collectively known as the Peace of God. Most narratives of clerical "peacemaking" date from the 1030s and 1040s, decades after the Peace movement's first blush. They should be read not as testimony to the collapse of law and order in 1000 but rather to the extraordinary ambitions, even optimism, of clergymen around midcentury. Eleventh-century accounts of fighting often record and denounce social conflict so as to redefine the very nature of peace, to make peacemaking into clerical oversight of the political and emotional welfare

13. In his introduction to *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Authority and Deviance in Western Europe, 950–1250* (Oxford, 2007; orig. 1987), 1–5, R. I. Moore refutes the notion that a rise in the pursuit of heresy equates to a rise in heresy itself. An analogous argument can be made regarding accounts of conflict in the eleventh century.

14. Compare here the Saxon chronicle of Widukind of Corvey, where peace is always described in terms of its proposed duration. Widukind describes several declarations of peace between the Ottonians and their neighbors, in which peace is usually followed by a stipulation that it shall be for a certain number of years and no more. *Res gestae Saxonicae* 1.32, ed. P. Hirsch and H.-E. Lohmann, MGH SSrGus 60 (Hannover, 1935), 45: "Rex autem spernens aurum, expostulate pacem, tandemque obtinuit, ut reddito captivo cum aliis muneribus, ad novem annos pax firmaretur." The Truce of God was similarly time-sensitive, and Glaber records that peace councils were to be repeated every five years for reconfirming the peace. See below.

of laypersons. As clerical responsibilities gained in nuance and number this definition of peace became more intricate.

The Peace of God

In 975, Guy, the new bishop of Le Puy in the Auvergne, gathered his quarreling diocesans at Saint-Germain-Laprade and imposed on them a collective oath of peace.[15] Nobody would have expected that promise to endure. Although God had willed a "tranquil and serene peace," and Guy threatened his flock with excommunication, he still relied on armed relatives to ensure he got their attention.[16] Guy repeated this assembly in 993 and expanded it to include nine bishops and two archbishops.[17] In that sense, Le Puy provided the paradigm for a series of peace councils in which knights, priests, and peasants swore mutual benefit on the relics of local saints—a trans-European social ordering process, the Peace of God.

Despite its construction as a "movement," the Peace of God is very hard to pin down, in part because bishops like Guy may have had a range of concerns, from restoration of church lands to moral remediation, for which "peace" was a useful containing category.[18] They also went about making peace in a variety of ways: military force, legislation, anathema, and miracles of healing. In a juridical sense, the Peace refers to a series of meetings in Aquitaine, Languedoc, and the Auvergne, and later across France.[19] At the earliest councils, prelates and knights agreed to place certain categories of

15. Harmut Hoffmann, *Gottesfriede und Treuga Dei*, MGH Schriften 20 (Stuttgart, 1964), 16–17.

16. *Chronicon monasterii Sancti Petri Aniciensis*, in *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Chaffre du Monastier, Ordre de Saint Benoit* 413–414, ed. Ulysse Chevalier (Paris, 1884; repr., 1891), 152–153. While Guy insisted that the assembled swear oaths to peace and the return of stolen goods, he wanted these oaths backed by pledges (*pro ipsa tenenda opsides darent*).

17. Lauranson-Rosaz, "Peace from the Mountains," 116–119.

18. Dominique Barthélemy disputes that the Peace of God was a movement, or that it can be linked to any wide-ranging millennial excitation. He argues that by means of these characterizations, the Peace of God has been rendered more transformative than it actually was. Barthélemy, *The Serf, the Knight, and the Historian*, trans. G. R. Edwards (Ithaca, NY, 2009; Fr. orig. 1997), 244–301. Hoffmann, *Gottesfriede*, provides the broadest range of activities and claims for which local princes fashioned the Peace and Truce of God.

19. The gatherings appeared in clusters: scattered meetings after 950 in the Auvergne, more formal episcopal assemblies after 980 in the Midi, which produced the first extensive legislation, and finally, after a two-decade lull, councils like Compiègne and Auxerre in Burgundy and parallel Provençal assemblies under the auspices of Cluny from 1020 onward. Their spread is described in Poly and Bournazel, *Feudal Transformation*, 151–156.

persons, such as monks or the poor, under exemption from despoilment.[20] The canons of the late tenth-century peace councils feature some of the earliest mentions of *malae consuetudines* or "wicked customs," a term common to monastic proprietary litigation, so the main purpose of these early councils might have been to demarcate certain church privileges.[21] As Hans-Werner Goetz correctly points out, the aims of these early councils were limited, and shaped largely by local ecclesiastical demands for protection.[22]

After 1020, however, lay magnates and imperial princes also began to take an interest in the peace assemblies. Robert the Pious swore an oath to preserve the peace of monasteries and churches; in view of canons from similar councils, "peace" here must refer to immunity from unjust incursions on lands and clients.[23] Lotharingian archbishops and imperial representatives attended peace meetings in Burgundy, and the Truce of God became a pledge that knights made to desist from violence at specific periods of the year.[24] Evident as far north as Flanders, the Truce was episodic, renewed or reinstated every few decades, and not limited to ecclesiastical mandate—or pacific aims. The Flemish counts Baldwin IV and V used a variation of the Truce to assemble a local fighting force; Pope Urban II used the occasion of Truce to summon the First Crusade. Around 1100, rebellious princes in southern Germany used the *Landfriede,* a territorial peace, to quiet their own regions and pursue war against Emperor Henry IV. In 1103, Henry IV responded to these hostile truces by proclaiming an "imperial peace" that would encompass the entire kingdom of Germany in a single bond.[25]

Bishops also used the peace to create a fighting force, but in doing so they risked becoming the violence that they opposed. As an extension of Christ's incarnate mercy, peace oaths were like sacraments—that is to say, a means of

---

20. For the edited peace charters, see Ludwig Huberti, *Studien zur Rechtsgeschichte der Gottesfrieden und Landfrieden*, vol. 1: *Die Friedensordnungen in Frankreich* (Ansbach, 1892).

21. Poly and Bournazel, *Feudal Transformation*, 34. See the argument regarding *malae consuetudines* as litigation and demarcation of authority developed in Tracey L. Billado, "The Politics of Evil Customs in Eleventh-Century Anjou (France)" (Ph.D. diss., Emory University, 2006). Also Billado, "Rhetorical Strategies and Legal Arguments: 'Evil Customs' and Saint-Florent de Saumur, 979–1011," in *Oral History of the Middle Ages: The Spoken Word in Context*, ed. Gerhard Jaritz and Michael Richter (Budapest, 2001), 128–141.

22. Hans-Werner Goetz, "Protection of the Church, Defense of the Law, and Reform: On the Purposes and Character of the Peace of God, 989–1038," in Head and Landes, *Peace of God*, 259–279.

23. Published in Roger Bonnaud-Delamare, "Les institutions de paix dans la provence ecclésiastique de Reims au onzième siècle," *Bulletin philologique et historique du comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques (jusqu'à 1715)* (1957): 148–153.

24. Poly and Bournazel, *Feudal Transformation*, 152.

25. Ian S. Robinson, *Henry IV of Germany, 1056–1106* (Cambridge, 1999), 309–320.

entry into and egress from the faith. When leaders bound followers to these oaths (called *sacramenta*), they had to ensure that the association remained committed to God's work, and not to the pursuit of any temporal authority that might accrue. Andrew of Fleury describes how in 1034 Bishop Aimon of Bourges formed a diocesan association, similar to Guy of Le Puy's but formalized by an oath that bound all adult males (over age fifteen). The oath of peace was to be upheld by military force, and even priests were enjoined to take up arms in its defense. At Bourges, we might be seeing one of the earliest communal armies, created by a bishop and held together by an oath for both the maintenance and the spread of a particularistic peace. This forceful peacemaking was presented as resistance to God's enemies, who had refused or violated the oath and thus were "without faith." Sworn on the relics of the protomartyr Stephen, the oath apparently clothed faithful peasants in an aura that caused fear among those outside the peace. Enemies fled their castles, allowing Aimon and his army of the peaceful to spread peace all over the region.

While admitting that military force could be used in the interest of God's peace, Andrew then also showed how peace itself could warp and be corrupted when its members stopped relying on God and united around mammon. Aimon and his supporters burned down a castle with the lord's family still in it, and as judgment, God left behind one "rebel," Odo of Deuil, to defeat the bishop and his peace. The peace association of Bourges had transformed from a blessed to a wicked peace, because after pacifying the countryside around them, the members had credited the peace to themselves and refused to recognize it as God's work. Protection of his own peace had become the bishop's obsession.[26]

In early peace gatherings, then, bishops *may* have been assuming political leadership in lieu of "failing comital power" (as Christian Lauranson-Rosaz puts it), but the primary purpose of God's peace was sacramental: the conduct of divine clemency through priestly vessels.[27] Bishop Aimon's job would have been to ensure the integrity of the sacrament by maintaining among his flock a genuine love of peace. Properly directed, that sacrament could

---

26. Andrew of Fleury and others, *Miracula sancti Benedicti* 5.1–4, ed. E. de Certain (Paris, 1858), 192–198. For a treatment of Aimon's group as both a peace association and a precursor to a commune, see Albert Vermeesch, *Essai sur les origines et la signification de la commune dans le nord de la France (XIe et XIIe siècles)* (Heule, 1966), 25–41; his edition of Andrew's account from MS. Vat. Reg. Lat. 592, 13r–15v, can be found on pp. 28–34. Also see Thomas Head, "The Judgment of God: Andrew of Fleury's Account of the Peace League of Bourges," in Head and Landes, *Peace of God*, 219–238; and a translation in the same volume, pp. 339–342.

27. Lauranson-Rosaz, "Peace from the Mountains," 116. These meetings were scattered and would not merit attention were it not for the later councils. Even the assembly at Saint-Germain-Laprade in 975 might be ignored if one went by documentary evidence alone. Narratives of the peace movement are much grander than the spare conciliar records.

have conveyed grace and mercy, but upon deviation it condemned those who partook of its illusory peace. A successor of the episcopal association, the commune would occupy a similarly ambivalent position, not inherently violent but with the potential to be so because its center was now a distorted oath or *sacramentum*.

In his *Five Books of Histories*, Raoul Glaber describes episcopal councils mushrooming all over the Auvergne and Aquitaine. Rocked by tempests at the end of the tenth century, the laity turned to their shepherds, just as the apostles had to Christ during a turbulent sea passage in Galilee.[28] The disturbances were not momentary but encompassed the entire secular condition: they included not just warfare but famine and disease as well.[29] The pastors answered with a simple measure: they called on all men to swear an oath of peace. It was essential that the world be pacified before the arrival of last days. At the millennium of the Passion (1033), many of these dangers passed away, and bishops and abbots in Aquitaine and Burgundy called large assemblies where peace was reestablished on the relics of saints.[30]

These peace councils were held not to produce a period of calm but to celebrate and consecrate it so that it took the name of genuine peace. They also became the occasion for pastors to demonstrate social leadership. In the name of peace, priests regulated wine consumption, healed the sick, and reaffirmed mankind's covenant with God. The clergy thus restored general welfare as powers and principalities could not. In the new millennium, through visions of peace, God was declaring a sea change in modes of authority and obedience.

For Glaber, the peace councils did not simply reconcile men with men but restored them to the face of God. Hence his attention to the fasts enjoined on the populace, and the miraculous healings performed by local saints whose relics were in attendance. The populace that cried out "Peace" under the raised croziers of their bishops became the sign of a perpetual covenant with God. That this covenant needed to be confirmed every five years does not strike Glaber as inconsistent with perpetuity.[31] Nor should it

28. Glaber, *Histories* 4.5.14, 194. He collapses several councils into the same year, the millennium of the Passion: 1033.

29. As H. E. J. Cowdrey, "The Peace and the Truce of God in the Eleventh Century," *Past and Present* 46 (Feb. 1970): 50, has noted, peacemaking meant an entire system of welfare and ministry, not just the abeyance of fighting.

30. Glaber, *Histories* 4.5.14, 195.

31. Glaber, *Histories* 4.5.16, 196.

in a world where communion was an endlessly repeated reconciliation with God enacted under the *signum* of the ceremony of Mass.

Fighting became the marker of spiritual lapse: descriptions of millennial violence bolstered the claim that the responsibility for peacemaking lay with the clergy. Glaber records that the heavens bestowed bumper harvests for the four years that followed the Aquitainian peace oaths. But like any other peace treaty, this agreement was prone to anxieties come the year of its renewal; many lapsed. Glaber labels them with Gregory the Great's term for apostates: dogs returning to their vomit, the sow of the proverb wallowing in its mire. These men broke their peace pacts with one another and thus with God.[32]

The spiritual ruin among the laity of Christendom seems to have produced a mirror image in its priests: betrayals of God's peace in France heralded the accession of a child pope in Rome, and disorder at the highest levels of church and kingdom. In the carefully constructed gaze of a newly self-conscious clergy, lay habits of fighting and friendship merely expressed much deeper discord that had captivated their spiritual superiors. In this way, aspirations to a monopolistic vision of peace drove clerics like Glaber to depict the church in a dialectical relationship with an inherently violent world.

The variegated Peace of God revealed the extent of these peacemaking aspirations. Its promoters made explicit claims to the social utility of churchmen and their sacraments in a world where charity and friendship lacked legitimate direction. Defense against marauders, miraculous cures, bumper harvests, and right ordering of social classes all came under the heading of peace because they represented God's favor transmitted to mankind by his priests. Since it specified not an everlasting peace but rather a temporally constrained one, the Truce of God might be considered a departure from this ideal. Yet even the Truce influenced the language and conduct of a papal reform that would pursue genuine peace using spiritual and even military force. When Gregory VII sent legates in 1079 to the archbishops of Germany and Saxony, attempting to draw them away from King Henry IV, he imposed on their regions a "definite (*firma*) peace without exception or deception [until] an appointed day"; violators of this peace would be bound in "chains of anathema" (*vincula anathematatis*).[33]

---

32. Glaber, *Histories* 4.5.17, 198; Prov. 26.11; 2 Pet. 2.22.

33. Paul of Bernried, *Vita Gregorii papae* 105, in *Pontificum Romanorum vitae*, ed. J. M. Watterich (Leipzig, 1862), 537–538.

The Lotharingian Legacy of Reforming Peace

The Peace of God was not the only means by which clergy could make claims to peace. In fact, many bishops opposed its terms, putting forth an alternative vision. Gerard of Cambrai attended the 1023 peace council at Compiègne but rejected the Peace of God as a solution. He also expressed disapproval of the Peace of Amiens-Corbie in 1034, the "return of Saturn's reign," according to those who favored it; Gerard felt it ruptured earthly order by diminishing hierarchies.[34] This was the occasion for his famous speech on the Three Orders. Gerard then took his message of dissent to Douai. Here he witnessed peace oaths used for the purpose of creating an army under Count Baldwin IV of Flanders. His successor Baldwin V would repeat this exercise in 1043. Gerard denounced the proceedings as a "false peace" (*pax falsa*). His opponent, Walter, the castellan of Cambrai, spread rumors that Gerard did not want to acquiesce to peace because he was not a "son of peace." Gerard proved his love of peace and surrendered his claims on Walter, but then he swung popular opinion to his side by insisting on the link between obedience, free will, and peace: true peace was essentially free obedience, not obtained by contractual oaths but through faith.[35]

"A man of Lorraine," as Duby puts it, Gerard of Cambrai had offered a Lotharingian alternative to the counterfeits of peace that he saw around him.[36] A glance at the Lotharingian monastic reform will tell us more about these evolving notions of peace and explain why the powerful metropolitans of Upper and Lower Lotharingia might resist more popular notions of peace. Theirs was a mode of peacemaking conditioned by empire, and yet, ironically, it was this mode that would dominate the reform enterprise of the popes most opposed to imperial supervision of the church.

The imperial vision of peace espoused by the Ottonians, the Salians, and their ecclesiastical kinsmen derives from early ninth-century theologies of politics. Roger Bonnaud-Delamare has reconstructed an idea of peace among the Carolingians that brought together complementary attitudes in Roman Christianity and the barbarian law codes. Following the Roman

34. *Miracula Sancti Adalhardi* 4.8, in PL 147:1067B for the image of Saturn's return. Duby, *Three Orders*, 24–25, on the speech. David C. Van Meter, "The Peace of Amiens-Corbie and Gerard of Cambrai's Oration on the Three Functional Orders: The Date, the Context, the Rhetoric," *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 74.3–4 (1996): 632–657, argues that it was delivered on the occasion of the peace between the two cities.

35. *Gesta ep. Cam.* 3.53, 486–3.54, 487. Riches, "Bishop Gerard I," 127–128.

36. Duby, *Three Orders*, 25.

imperial pattern, the *Lex Visigothorum* and *Lex Bavariorum* present peace as discipline and welfare. Like a sacrament, peace was enacted by a kiss, and it benefited the general populace while nourishing God's servants. For Carolingian commentators, it was a cosmic order embodied in the *ecclesia*, and its maintenance rested with the church; all persons partook of this order through their connections with the church.[37] Thus the church became the vessel of the imperial peace, in the same way that it served as the conduit for God's grace.

In Lotharingia, relatives of the emperors served as princes of the church and in the name of the emperor ensured this peace in the monasteries under their supervision. A diamond cut by two rivers, the Meuse and the Moselle, connects the main centers of the Lotharingian monastic reform: the imperial dioceses of Metz, Verdun, Toul, Trier, and Liège working in counterpoint with the abbeys of Gorze, Saint-Evre, Remiremont, and St-Maximin and the nunnery of Bouxières-aux-Dames. While much has been made of the prodigious growth and influence of the great Auvergian abbey of Cluny in the tenth and especially the eleventh century, it is only recently that English scholarship has given Cluny's Lotharingian counterpart, Gorze, the place it deserves.[38]

The contentious partnership between the bishops of Metz and the abbots of Gorze and the spread of the Gorzian model make it a progenitor of a pattern of episcopal oversight that began under the term "peacemaking." The Lotharingian pattern made its way to Rome via the diocese of Toul, home to abbeys like Saint-Evre whose reforming abbot Humbert had once been mentor to John of Gorze. In 1026 the diocese found its preeminent peacemaker in Bishop Bruno, the future Pope Leo IX. Like his friend and former teacher, Adalbero III, bishop of Metz, Bruno gained a reputation as a "lover of peace" both as bishop and pope.[39] As the next chapter suggests, he

37. Roger Bonnaud-Delamare, *L'idée de paix à l'époque carolingienne* (Paris, 1939), 76–82.

38. This is not the case, for example, in Germany. The classic study, Kassius Hallinger, *Gorze-Kluny: Studien zu den monastischen Lebensformen und Gegensätzen im Hochmittelalter*, 2 vols., Studia Anselmiana 22–23 and 24–25 (Rome, 1950–51), esp. vol. 2, locates the religious reform of the Central Middle Ages around both these institutions, while providing a comprehensive yet minute description of their differences.

39. For Adalbero III, see *Gesta episcoporum Mettensium* 49, ed. D. G. Waitz, MGH SS 10:543: "pacis amator et coenobiorum reparator." The mantle of peacemaker also descended on lay rulers who reformed monasteries. The tenth-century West Saxon king Edgar gained the label "pacificus" in the twelfth century, thanks to the monk John of Worcester, who concentrated on that bellicose leader's patronage of the Benedictine reform. Shashi Jayakumar, "Some Reflections on the 'Foreign Policies' of Edgar 'the Peaceable,'" *Haskins Society Journal* 10 (2001): 17–37.

employed the same peacemaking methods in both offices, unseating ineffective abbots and replacing them with men known to him.

Monastic reform in Lotharingia meant not moral or liturgical reform as much as institutional rebuilding, the reclamation of lands lost or disputed as a result of Norse invasions, and (in contrast to Cluny) a partnership between monasteries and local bishops that was dominated by the latter. Historians suggest that the Lotharingian model appeared in Spain and Italy as early as the tenth century thanks to the travels of John, cellarer and later abbot of Gorze; it is more certain that Richard, the eleventh-century abbot of St. Vanne in Verdun, carried the Gorzian reform to the border of Flanders. Richard spent time in Liège, where the association between Folcuin of Lobbes and Bishop Notker of Liège had already presaged the pattern of reforms farther south. Richard was one of the imperial ambassadors at the Burgundian peace council of 1023 (Compiègne).[40]

Messy and contentious from the outset, major reform took place only after the Ottonian acquisition of Lotharingia.[41] Monasteries were restored to a condition that they had supposedly enjoyed before the Norman invasions of the late ninth century. In some cases, the restoration and restitution of lands folded into a broader "refoundation" process that fixed the memory of patronage and property in the charters and subsequent chronicles of each abbey.[42] The abbeys served as centers of complex proprietary transactions between nobles, peasants, and princes of the church, and even as they transformed into liturgical powerhouses during the tenth century, monasteries and nunneries remained sources of military assistance, holding areas for prospective heirs and places of refuge for nobility. Many bishops and archdeacons would at some point in their careers serve as abbots, including Einold, who headed Gorze at the height of its reform. These men generally came from eminent families and were often siblings of the very "marauders" who contested with them over monastic property.

The corollary of abbatial social eminence was the abbot's relative detachment from his fellow monks.[43] Abbots often did not live in the cloister, and

40. Poly and Bournazel, *Feudal Transformation*, 152.

41. Michel Parisse, "Contexte Politique," in *L'abbaye de Gorze au Xe siècle*, ed. Michel Parisse and Otto Gerhard Oexle (Nancy, 1993), 64.

42. On refoundation, see Amy G. Remensnyder, *Remembering Kings Past: Monastic Legends in Medieval Southern France* (Ithaca, NY, 1995).

43. Phyllis G. Jestice, *Wayward Monks and the Religious Revolution of the Eleventh Century* (Leiden, 1997), 24–29.

lay abbacy disappeared only in the tenth century. By the early 900s, abbots included Humbert of Saint-Evre and John of Gorze, whose middling status and emergence from the ranks allowed chroniclers to represent them as men of humble background. They still engaged on terms of relative parity with bishops, however, and in John's case thanks to complex familial relationships and a rich education.[44] The monastic existence could not easily be separated from other ties of kinship and service, nor was there much advantage in such separation, given the politics of reform in Lotharingia.

Since the bulk of our evidence regarding these relationships comes from monastic chronicles and charters, the centrality of Lotharingian houses may be exaggerated; but that bias itself shows how monasteries monopolized communal memory. The charter evidence further suggests that "reform" is in part a rhetorical styling of shifting power relationships, whereby important bishops like Adalbero I of Metz wrested control of client networks from great lay lords like the Bosonids by the middle of the tenth century. The peace and prosperity that abbeys like Gorze gained thanks to their episcopal patrons came at the cost of other local clientage. Count Adalbert, brother-in-law and one time benefactor of Adalbero, was the big loser in Gorze's revival, but other bishops suffered as well.[45] The dominance of "reformer" bishops could lead to resentment buried deep in monastic chronicles and emerging full-blown by the end of the eleventh century.

Lotharingian chroniclers from the late tenth and early eleventh centuries speak of these powerful, interfering bishops as peacemakers: *pacifici* and *pacis amatores*. John Nightingale has argued that the *Miracula Gorgonii* and the *Vita Johannis Gorziensis*, literary accounts of Bishop Adalbero's great reform of 934, refract Gorze's turbulent contests with the diocese of Metz into a mirror of peace: the texts are at once prescriptive and commemorative of an ideal harmony rarely achieved.[46] In their protestations of peace and mutual benefit these institutional biographies encode the same tussles for rights and property that feature in accounts that allege *malae consuetudines* (wicked customs) of lay lords.[47] Even though these narratives present bishops as exact opposites of bullying counts, both sets of rulers (who were often kinsmen or

44. John of Saint-Arnoul, *Vita Johannis Gorziensis*, ed. G. H. Pertz, MGH SS 4: 9.339–13.350 (henceforth *Vita JG*) for John's familial background and ascendancy.

45. John Nightingale, *Monasteries and Patrons in the Gorze Reform: Lotharingia, c. 850–1000* (Oxford, 2001), 77.

46. Nightingale, *Monasteries and Patrons*, 71–72.

47. Billado, "Rhetorical Strategies," 128–141.

even brothers) employed the same strategies of domination and acquisition. According to Nightingale, Adalbero's reform of Ste-Glossinde provides a glimpse of reform in action: the subordination of administrative reorganization to the protection of patrimonial holdings against future challenges.[48] The bishop of Metz reestablished the Benedictine Rule at the nunnery and thus effectively refounded it. Then he gifted it the abbey of Hastière, which he had recently acquired, and which was and would continue to be a point of much contention between Metz and Liège. He made his niece Himiltrud abbess of Ste-Glossinde. As Nightingale interprets this sequence, Adalbero was using the nunnery as a safe deposit box for possessions that he wished to keep closely tied to his family. His successors at Metz removed Hastière from Ste-Glossinde (and hence from Adalbero's kin) but maintained it within the diocese of Metz by gifting it to another monastery that Adalbero had acquired.[49]

Reform thus had a number of elements that worked together or separately: the wresting of property from a rival; preservation of the property within a diocese or family by attachment to another house; use of said property to buy the loyalties of other newly acquired houses; attempts to secure property by putting a relative or client in charge, either of the property itself or of the abbey that held it. To describe reform in this manner does not discount its religious and emotional content. Nightingale rightly points out that these gifts and restorations of property would have been seen as benefices, or good works. But in addition these texts had audiences within the episcopal circle; they maintained a memory that would serve as a basis for continued relationships between the abbey, the bishop, and the saint. In that sense, they were a concord, even if that concord was contentious. As Nightingale's comparison with charters suggests, stories of Adalbero's discovery of the befouled altar of Saint Gorgon and that saint's regular admonishment of him are the literary equivalent of a continuous negotiation between the abbey's new patron and its monks.[50] The pugilistic nature of such patronage and friendship should not detract from the closeness of the parties involved: a counterpoint of love and anger emerges from humbler associations as well, witness Bernard of Anger's description in the early eleventh century of Sainte Foy's frequently cruel patronage of her wretched

48. Nightingale, *Monasteries and Patrons*, 71–76.

49. Ibid., 76–77.

50. Ibid., 79. For the befouled altar, see *Vita JG* 39.348.

but devout clients.[51] Similarly, Adalbero's quarrels with the abbey of Gorze became a logical extension of his friendship, regular conflict safeguarded under the rubric of a loving peace.

These bishops saw themselves imitating past kings, conferring a variant of Carolingian peace that would guide the ambitions of Otto III, Henry III, and Henry's Lotharingian kinsman, Bruno of Toul. The prince protected a realm that aspired to the ideal peace reflected by the church.[52] At the level of a powerful bishop, protection of peace meant protection of the one space that epitomized peace on earth, the monastery, an abode of celestial silence. In theory, monks, especially those who had joined in their infancy, remained cut off from the world through special regulations and a daily round of prayer that kept them suspended in a living death, as close as possible to the saints who served as their protectors. The peace of the monastery also had a more pointed, contextual reference. The demands imposed by outside lords and neighbors included the *servitium*, military service that could run from provisioning an army to supplying it with warriors.[53] At Cluny, the liturgical round expanded to replace such activities, becoming the means of detachment and a service rendered to those who allowed monks their peace.[54] But that peace of the monastery was largely a (Cluniac) fiction and was superseded by more active peacemaking principles, which included conversion and ministry.

Even during the tenth and eleventh centuries, monks were no less able to escape their worldly attachments than bishops. For a monk, to live in peace meant to live in a state of continuous unrest between spiritual attainments and material needs and desires. The influential abbots of Cluny and Fleury were men of noble birth. Lotharingian abbots in the tenth and eleventh centuries did not come from as elevated backgrounds but their world and

51. Bernard of Angers, *Liber miraculorum sancte Fidis* 1, ed. A. Bouillet (Paris, 1897), 6–15. The child saint healed a man named Vuitbert, who was blinded in an assault. However, she repeatedly afflicted him with a recurrence of blindness when he seemed to lapse from the faith, neatly demonstrating the alternating care and reproof that marked patron-client relationships in the Central Middle Ages.

52. Bonnaud-Delamare, *L'idée de paix*, 76–82.

53. Jestice, *Wayward Monks*, 31. On the monastic *servitium regis* in the empire, see John W. Bernhardt, *Itinerant Kingship and Royal Monasteries in Early Medieval Germany, c. 936–1075* (Cambridge, 1993), 75–94; and Carlrichard Brühl, *Fodrum, gistum, servitium regis* (Cologne, 1968), 452–577.

54. Barbara Rosenwein, "Feudal War and Monastic Peace: Cluniac Liturgy as Ritual Aggression," *Viator* 2 (1971): 129–157; Dominique Iogna-Prat, *Order and Exclusion: Cluny and Christendom Face Heresy, Judaism, and Islam (1000–1150)*, trans. Graham Edwards (Ithaca, NY, 2002), 327.

their reforms had a strong economic and political component. John of Saint-Arnoul's *vita* of John of Gorze presents its hero beset by struggle against divergent parts of himself and against the world. The author wrote from his own standpoint as an abbot, one who must have straddled the same chasms of spirituality and administration that opened before Bishop Adalbero and John the Cellarer. While it was relatively easy to resolve the discrepancies between *orator* and *bellator* as they appeared in the career of Bishop Adalbero, a monk's story must be different, and thus the contradictions between John as administrator and holy man emerge full-blown. Even as a single clerical identity was evolving in the south and west of France, in Lotharingia, the monk must remain *pauperus*, and hence distinct from the ecclesial princes. Tensions in the *vita* testify to an increasing unfeasibility of this separation on the ground.

The hard-nosed John of Gorze must have made a particularly difficult subject. He grew up in a well-known and obviously well-connected family, rich in money and, even more importantly, in friendships, yet his biographer insists on comparing him to the biblical David and Peter, men of humble beginnings who rose to greatness instead of renouncing power that they already had.[55] It seems that John began his career primarily as an administrator, serving in Verdun at the courts of Count Ricuin and Bishop Dado, and evidently much coveted for his abilities. His contact with monasteries began not through oblation but in his capacity as an agent for a nobleman named Warnier.[56] John was a well-traveled cosmopolitan, who conducted an embassy to Córdoba late in life and took in a tour of Vesuvius during a visit to Naples.[57] John of Saint-Arnoul's account of John's life betrays embarrassment at these secular engagements. Thus the administrator John displays extreme piety even as he carries out his duties; he forms a close friendship with the respected hermit Humbert, future abbot of Saint-Evre; he receives inspiration from monastic communities during his visit to Vesuvius; and he is tormented by demons. The cellarer would toss and turn in bed, railing against imposters, and reproaching Saint Laurent for not defending him.[58]

Conflict is everywhere in the life of John, anxious as he was to resist contact with the world while also determined to fulfill his vow of obedience

55. *Vita JG* 7.339.

56. *Vita JG* 12–13.340.

57. *Vita JG* 118.371.

58. *Vita JG* 14.341: "Laurenti, quid hic agis, cur non me his vesanis defendis?" Also 17.342.

to Abbot Einold. The *vita*'s focus is on his time as a filter between the outside world and cloister, and, as Phyllis Jestice notes, the role of cellarer was the ultimate test of John's ability to engage with worldly concerns without succumbing to them.[59] Thus, rather than read the text as a celebration of John's desire to reject the *saeculum*, I suggest we see it as an attempt to expand the monastic enterprise. The monk is a soldier, who finds his peace not in the "eternal silence" of the cloister but rather in the battles that he fights on its threshold against his material urges and the world's demands. John's inner struggles found an echo in the events of his day. Even as he pleaded with the saint to defend him against the demons of his own necessities, Norman raiders attacked the churches of the Seine and Loire valleys. Similar to the *Vita Angskari*, written a hundred years earlier, the *Vita* of John of Gorze features episodes in which the holy man reveals his sanctity when attacked by foreign oppressors. In John's case, the Normans threw him off their ship, but to their amazement he refused to drown.[60] Rather than dying to the world upon entry into the monastery, John constantly returns to it and refuses to be killed: he is a Christian soldier rather than a living saint.

Alongside spiritual struggles and bodily perils, the reform of Gorze was itself a constant battle with advocates such as Count Adalbert and his rival and brother-in-law, Bishop Adalbero, who had set himself up as the abbey's patron. John's task was to tread a path between these bullying nobles; his friendship with Bishop Adalbero was a pugnacious one, susceptible to episodes of pique and anguish. Neither Adalbero nor John was a stranger to this kind of belligerent love, for their own saints had been harsh and often reticent protectors.

The jostling and conflict characteristic of the Gorzian reform could not be confused with violence. That word had been reserved for men like Count Adalbert, *ferox* and *violentus*, who had illegally occupied the abbey of Gorze and then left it unattended.[61] The term *violentia* needs to be examined in context to understand what it meant to be violent, as opposed to quarrelsome or warlike, during the Central Middle Ages. In monastic clamors against marauding neighbors, *violentia* was neither simply the use of armed force—our normative understanding of the term—nor a strategic deployment of

59. Jestice implies that the *vita* celebrates the extreme piety of the Gorzian monks to the exclusion of their managerial concerns, but the fact that the author closes before John's own abbacy suggests otherwise. *Wayward Monks*, 33–35.

60. *Vita JG* 15.341.

61. *Vita JG* 36.347: "vir genere quidem clarus, ingenio autem ferox ac violentus."

accusations within a process of litigation over property.[62] It could include these elements, but its distinctive feature was love that had gone slightly wrong. When friendship depended on a shifting equilibrium of energetic, even belligerent demands, any misdirection or betrayal laid both parties open to charges of violence.[63] The level of violence could not be gauged by the amount of fighting or by the intensity of a quarrel. Instead, *violentia* refuted the viability of a patron-client relationship and the validity of a would-be patron's claim of advocacy.

We can track changes in the validation of authority by following the pattern of *violentia*. Into the tenth century, the Lotharingian bishop, balancing piety with administrative expertise, served as the ideal type for the peacemaker or *pacificus*, the one who could ensure the peace of fellow men of prayer because he understood its importance.[64] During the next two hundred years, bishops lost this monopoly over peace. However, the language of reformist peace cut both ways. By the end of the eleventh century, this same vigorous brand of peacemaking would lay Lotharingian bishops open to the charge of "violence," sometimes from reform-minded popes.

In the wake of the Gregorian reform, a bishop was subject to the same spiritual demands as a monk: detachment from a violent world of politics, sex, and warfare, standards that could be held against him as and when political opportunities demanded. Lotharingian bishops could no longer dominate the administration of monasteries to the extent that they had a century before, at the outset of the Gorzian reform.[65] At least, they could, but then they could not also claim to be lovers of peace without having to contend with the counterclaim. Accusations of violence soon descended on them, and by the late eleventh century, monks had begun to turn to the papacy

---

62. Cf. Dominique Barthélemy, "The 'Feudal Revolution'" (I), *Past and Present* 152 (Aug. 1996): 196–205; and White, "The 'Feudal Revolution'" (II), 205–223.

63. These ideas are presented in Jehangir Malegam, "Love between Peace and Violence" (conference panel in honor of Stephen D. White, Kalamazoo, MI, May 15, 2010). See Malegam, "Love between Peace and Violence: Not a Crisis but a Critique of Fidelity after 1000," *Quaestiones Medii Aevi novae* 16 (2011): 321–336.

64. See John S. Ott, "'Both Mary and Martha': Bishop Lietbert of Cambrai and the Construction of Episcopal Sanctity in a Border Diocese around 1100," in Ott and Trumbore, *Bishop Reformed*, 137–160. I thank the author for allowing me to read the article before its publication.

65. Phyllis Jestice has described how reform monks in the region increasingly expressed their desire to spread light to the world, to educate and to conduct pastoral activities that bishops had previously monopolized. Jestice, "The Gorzian Reform and the Light under the Bushel," *Viator* 24 (1993): 51–78. My thanks to Geoffrey Koziol for the reference and for suggesting an examination of the aims of the Gorzian reform.

for assistance against "violent" and "invasive" bishops. In 1098, the Liègeois bishop Otbert incurred such epithets from Pope Urban II, after several client monasteries had complained about his attempts at reform.[66] *Violentia* pointed to failings that extended beyond a bishop's robust style of governance to his fundamental fitness for priesthood. He stood revealed as a wolf in shepherd's garb who would devour his flock through usurpation and deceit sooner than convey to them the divine nourishment of a true sacrament.

The fragile balance between the peace and violence of Lotharingian bishops illuminates the transfer and transformation of reformist vocabulary between Alsace-Lorraine and Rome. It allows us to examine a language of resistance and control from its beginnings in territory on the imperial frontier to its gestation in Rome, the hub of a revolution against imperial sovereignty over the church. Monks' readiness to accuse bishops of violence certainly suggests an increase in rivals for monastic affection, among the laity and in the papacy. At the same time it points to growing confidence among monks that they too could be peacemakers.

While bishops had dominated church reform and, apparently, the early Peace of God movement, by the second half of the eleventh century, monks too were appropriating peace to express reformist and pastoral aspirations.[67] Rendered in broad strokes, monastic aspirations of peace privileged disciplinary processes that were disruptive and aimed at the liberation of Christians who had subjugated the pleasures of reason to the delusions of the world. Among papal reformers, Peter Damian and Hildebrand espoused these notions of peace, each in his own way, while in the cut of the Meuse and Moselle, a vocabulary of disruptive peace circulated at a local level, thanks to educated clergymen who lacked the political clout of ecclesiastical princes and great abbeys.

We can appreciate the latter's hubris by examining an account from the abbey of Lobbes in Hainault. Peacemaking at its most turbulent and transformative, the story of Saint Ursmar of Lobbes's miracles testifies to the driving principles of an extensive and pervasive religious reform movement. Through the power of their saint's relics, the Lobbesians would offer peace to unreformed communities, just as the apostles had to the gentiles of Galilee. Once they accepted the gift of peace, a turbulent emotional transformation liberated the converted from their previous misguided pacts and compromises.

66. See below, chapter 3.

67. Van Meter, "Peace of Amiens-Corbie," 633–634, follows Hoffmann, *Gottesfriede*, 114–148, in attributing a leading role to bishops rather than monks but points out that for all its leadership of the councils, little is known about the secular clergy's rhetoric of peace.

The Lobbesian narrative thus depicts mass religious conversion as interpersonal reconciliations and changes in social practice: a move from "false peace" to "true."

True and False Peace in the Miracles of Saint Ursmar of Lobbes

Around 1060, in the Flemish town of Strazeele, where "no mortal had been able to make peace," monks from the abbey of Lobbes arrived with the relics of their saint Ursmar to pacify the feuding inhabitants. The Lobbesians gathered the bellicose townspeople in a public assembly. When asked to come together in a circle, surly antagonists joined "willy-nilly" (*voluisse-noluisse*). A few knights hung back, upon which a deacon named Baldwin raised the relics of Ursmar from within the circle. The elevation of relics, a gesture imbued with great dramatic and spiritual force, was often a part of public revelations of sanctity and authenticity.[68] At Strazeele, it seems to have compelled knights to join the group. Suddenly, as the circle was about to close, a black dog walked in between the community that had formed around the saint and those who had been dragging their feet. Entranced, the knights broke the circle and raced off in pursuit of the animal, eventually dying in a series of blood feuds. Realizing they could do little more for the town, the brothers of Lobbes left Strazeele to its fate.[69] Although the knights of Strazeele died as they had lived, fighting, the peacemaking event can be considered a success, one that demonstrates the ambitions of minor clergy against a backdrop of great eleventh-century drives for peace and reform.

A Salian stronghold and the westernmost territory annexed by Louis the German, Lotharingia (Alsace-Lorraine) had close ecclesiastical and political ties to France and the Low Countries. It adjoined Flanders, whose counts were often at war with the Salian rulers and their allies.[70] The imperial diocese of Liège occupied Lower Lotharingia and controlled the abbey of

68. Patrick Geary, "Sacred Commodities: The Circulation of Medieval Relics," in *Living with the Dead*, 203–204, on the public ritual of elevation.

69. *Historia miraculorum in circulatione per Flandriam*, in *De Sancto Ursmaro episcopo et abbate in Belgio* 1.5, ed. G. Henschen, Acta SS 11 (April) 2:571 (henceforth *MSU*).

70. Count Baldwin V and Henry III were at war between 1053 and 1056. When papal-imperial relations deteriorated in the 1060s, the Flemish counts sided with the papacy, and at the end of the century, Robert of Flanders attacked the diocese of Cambrai at the behest of Pope Paschal II. The Flemish count Charles the Good was the putative next Roman emperor when he was murdered in 1127.

Lobbes, a tenth-century intellectual center, home to Rather of Verona, and Heriger, and credited with the beginnings of the Liègeois cathedral school.[71] Lobbes had long held land in Flanders, but Liège had advocacy of the abbey dating from an alliance between Abbot Folcuin and Bishop Notker of Liège in the early tenth century. In the late eleventh century, even as the abbey's glory was fading, its monks expressed reformist aspirations through the language of peacemaking. Some time between 1060 and 1140, a Lobbesian monk described a tour of relics that he and his brothers had made through Flanders.[72] Featuring multiple episodes of peacemaking, the *Miracula sancti Ursmari* (Miracles of Saint Ursmar) echoes the ministry of Christ's apostles in Galilee. By bringing the relics of their patron Ursmar to the quarrelsome inhabitants of various Flemish towns, the Lobbesian monks effectively conveyed a new and authentic peace, emotional and spiritual transformations that represented their contribution to social ordering in the region.[73]

The story of Ursmar's peacemaking miracles stands apart from the Lotharingian peace of bishops and also from the Peace of God councils, especially those northern French councils that culminated in timed Truces of God rather than aspirations for eternal peace. In the narrative, these other forms of peacemaking appear diminished in relationship to the Lobbesian peace, most notably when the monks arrive at a peace council (likely the Council of Therouanne in 1063) where matters are at a standstill. The monks manage to instill love of peace in the hearts of the count and bishops by exposing the saint's relics.[74] Thus the relic tour intersected with other drives toward peacemaking, and the memorialization competes with them. Lobbesian peace also differed in terms of its targets. Episcopal peacemaking in Lotharingia

71. John Van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz* (Berkeley, 1983) 43–44; Folcuin, *Gesta abbatum Lobbiensium*, ed. G. Pertz, MGH SS 4:69–71; *Gesta abbatum Lobbiensium continuata*, ed. W. Arndt, MGH SS 21:308–309. The abbey also had a famous scriptorium. A decorated Lobbesian Bible served at Trent as an exemplum for the Vulgate text. Joseph Warichez, *L'abbaye de Lobbes: Depuis les origines jusqu' en 1200; Étude d'histoire générale et spéciale* (Louvain, 1909), 78.

72. For all its richness, the *Miracula sancti Ursmari* is problematic because the original manuscripts that contained it are lost. The text did find its way into the Abbé Durand's *Spicilegium* in the seventeenth century (see Paris, BnF Lat 13932, fol. 1) along with other histories of Lobbes. Apart from the Acta Sanctorum edition that I have used and cited above, there is also a slightly abridged version, *Miracula sancti Ursmari in itinere per Flandriam facta*, ed. O. Holder-Egger, MGH SS 15:837–842.

73. Jehangir Malegam, "No Peace for the Wicked: Conflicting Visions of Peacemaking in an Eleventh-Century Monastic Narrative," *Viator* 39.1 (2008): 23–49.

74. *MSU* 2.9, 572. The meeting is given as Bergues in the text and may refer to (or be inspired by) the peace council that took place at nearby Thérouanne in 1063. *Treuga Dei dioecesis tervanensis*, MGH Const. 1:599–601; and Hoffmann, *Gottesfriede*, 146–148.

generally meant renewal and reorganization of monasteries, and the Peace of God appears to have been a mode of power sharing between knights and clerics, especially in Flanders, where Baldwins IV, V, and VI declared the Peace in conjunction with bishops.[75] The Lobbesians meanwhile focused their peace on the errant and wayward populace of numerous Flemish *oppida*, dogs who had returned to their vomit not only by fighting but through a general religious lapse. The "fighting ways" (*mos pugnandi*) of these villagers spoke to a much deeper violence, one that could be eradicated only through the conveyance of grace via the saint. Through peace, then, monks like the Lobbesians were asserting their own claim to be spiritual and social guides in the vanguard of reform.

As Bishop Gerard of Cambrai had almost forty years before, the Lobbesians were offering true peace in place of false. Along with the extensive narrative, likely written not long after the journey, the Lobbesian relic tour of Flanders also appears in the abbey's twelfth-century chronicle, which mentions the existence of an earlier *libellus*. In both cases, the context for the journey is described as a false peace. The twelfth-century Lobbesian chronicle places the relic tour in a time of *pax umbratica*, illusory peace.[76] The term *umbratica* has a long association with emptiness and carnality and speaks directly to eleventh- and twelfth-century discussions of sacraments devoid of grace—that is to say, sacraments accepted only with the external senses and not by the intellect.[77] Vernacular literature intended for mixed religious and lay audiences also associates this word with emptiness and deception, especially as it pertains to sociopolitical bonds. The twelfth-century *Song of Roland* contains a poignant image of the deceitful king Marsile, who offered false peace to Ganelon, now "descending into the shadow" of an olive tree, the symbol of peace: "suz un olive est descundut en l'umbre."[78] The description in the tour narrative is even more blunt: "licet falsa, justitia et pax . . . reddeunt," a situation that presumably the monks wished to adjust to their own notions of peace. Peace and justice had been falsified, alleges the author, and "the reign of Saturn [only] *seemed* to return."[79] A twist on Virgil's pastoral, the seeming

75. Hoffmann, *Gottesfriede*, 63, 114–148. Geoffrey Koziol, "Monks, Feuds, and the Making of Peace in Eleventh-Century Flanders," in Head and Landes, *Peace of God*, 239.

76. *Gesta abbatum Lobbiensium continuata*, 310–311.

77. Malegam, "No Peace for the Wicked," 41.

78. *Chanson de Roland*, lais 187, verse 2571, in *The Song of Roland: An Analytical Edition*, ed. Gerard Brault (University Park, PA, 1978), 157. I thank Philippe Buc for alerting me to this passage.

79. *MSU* 1.1, 570: "Visa sunt Saturnia regna redisse" (emphasis added).

return of Saturn mocks local clergy in Corbie and Amiens who had greeted peace contracts between those cities with similar invocations of the harvest god's reign.[80] The Lobbesian narrator thus demonstrates little faith in urban peace accords, portraying them as just another facet of the Flemings' *mos pugnandi*.[81] In their place, Ursmar's bearers offer genuine peace.

To unravel the narrative of Ursmar's miracles requires an understanding of how an eleventh-century monastery would have seen itself.[82] It was a complex of fidelities and community memory in which monks litigated constantly, not just against lay marauders but also against their own history, jockeying for footholds of spiritual and political authority. Once significant players in the region, the Lobbesians now asserted their continued relevance among the bishops of Liège and Cambrai and the rulers of Flanders and Germany by claiming to be peacemakers. By the middle of the eleventh century, reform of morals, practice, and administration had become a concern for ecclesial and lay princes and had taken the name of peace. While Adalbero III was a "lover of peace" who restored monasteries, and Leo IX brought peace to the house of Peter, Emperor Henry III had been styled "lord of peace," and Baldwin V of Flanders unified his Flemish knights in 1043 by declaring a Truce of God.[83] The mandate of peacemaker served as an impressive vehicle for proprietary as well as spiritual ambitions, ambitions that reshaped themselves in dialogue with these expanding notions of peace.

With regard to Lobbes, the author of the *Miracles* cedes the ultimate power of peacemaking to the abbey's saint but makes the monks the conveyors of this peace, thus styling them in an apostolic mode. They were carrying out

---

80. *Miracula Sancti Adalhardi* 4.8, 1067B: "Una conveniunt *pax* et *justitia*: jamjam placet redire Saturnia regna." It is tempting to compare the Lobbesian author's scorn to Gerard of Cambrai's disapproval on very different grounds, enshrined a few years before in the *Deeds of the Bishops of Cambrai*. See *Gesta ep. Cam* 3.52, 485–486. Here again I follow the chronology of events suggested by Van Meter, "Peace of Amiens-Corbie," 655. See above, note 35.

81. *MSU* 2.12, 573: "quia in ea primo semper habetur mos pugnandi, numquam tamen copia vincendi."

82. As John Nightingale points out, "An abbey was the sum not just of its monks but also of its relics, of its churches, of those buried within them, and, not least, of its widely scattered estates and dependent churches." Nightingale, *Monasteries and Patrons*, 3. See also Steffen Patzold, *Konflikte im Kloster: Studien zu Auseinandersetzungen in monastischen Gemeinschaften des ottonisch-salischen Reichs* (Husum, 2000), an in-depth study of conflict within and between religious houses of the tenth and eleventh centuries that assesses the impact of external social relationships on internal monastic politics and compares gestures and strategies previously identified in the cultural processing of lay conflict to interactions in the cloister.

83. See Goetz, "Protection of the Church," 259–279, on the regnal (and therefore conservative) ambitions of the peace movement.

Christ's injunction to his apostles to go into every house and declare peace upon the inhabitants, and if that peace was refused, to walk away, shaking the dust off their sandals. The *Miracula sancti Ursmari* was an effort to make this peace in a monastic—and specifically Lobbesian—image, so that it minimized, even invalidated competing meanings.

In 1060, the monks of Lobbes entered Flanders as strangers, since their abbey lay in neighboring Hainault. Their author thus denies them the political embeddedness that might have assisted normative social ordering.[84] However, the monks were empowered by past holiness and by future, anticipated relationships with this hostile region. Count Baldwin V of Flanders had named as heir apparent his son, Baldwin, who through marriage was at that time count of Hainault. So the Lobbesians represented an early, self-mandated embassy. At the same time, they were reenacting the history of evangelism in Flanders, since the abbey's patron saint, Ursmar, an apostle of the Flemings, had converted the pagan Menapii and other Belgic populations in the late seventh century.[85] Periodic miracles around Ursmar's shrine had kept the saint's cult alive at least in Hainault, as had the literary efforts of abbots Folcuin (a chronicle of the abbey with a catalogue of Ursmar's posthumous miracles) and Heriger (a life of Ursmar in metrical verse). The Flemings, on the other hand, seemed to have forgotten him, as evidenced by their bellicose customs. Ursmar had reappeared in 1060 to indict their forgetfulness and lapsed religiosity. The saint's legendary projects of conversion and spiritual transformation were being resumed anew.

The recession of Ursmar's legend in Flanders had gone hand in hand with a decline in Lobbes's own presence in the region. Ostensibly, the Lobbesian expedition was a tour of relics, a *delatio*, aimed at the recovery of ancestral territories that the abbey had once held and later lost in Flanders. The author of the *Miracles of Saint Ursmar* attributes the loss of holdings to a war between Baldwin V and Emperor Henry III that abated in 1056 when Henry died suddenly. After taking stock and asking permission of local bishops and their count, Lobbes's abbot, Adelard, sent his monks to reclaim the loyalties

84. On mediating roles performed by actors with loyalties divided across party lines, see Max Gluckman, "The Peace in the Feud," *Past and Present* 8 (Nov. 1955): 1–14. Cf. Stephen D. White, "Feuding and Peacemaking in the Touraine," *Traditio* 42 (1986): 207–213.

85. Warichez, *L'abbaye de Lobbes*, 17–18. Abbot Folcuin's tenth-century house chronicle iterates the material and spiritual relationship between Ursmar and the Flemish. *Gesta abbatum Lobbiensium*, 57–58. For Lobbes's territories in the Carolingian *pagus Flandrensis*, see Jean-Pierre Devroey, *Le polyptyque et les listes de biens de l'abbaye Saint-Pierre de Lobbes (IXe–XIe siècles)* (Brussels, 1986), lxxxi–lxxxiii.

of the Flemish holdings, and to collect funds for the restoration of Saint Peter's church at the abbey. Adelard encouraged the tour of Flanders, even though—or perhaps because—the recent peace there appeared false. The author of the *Miracles* makes this false peace, rather than fund-raising, the focus of the story.

With regard to raising money, the tour does not seem to have been memorable—or profitable. Even though the Lobbesians were eventually able to expand the church, the funds do not seem to have come from the places described in the account. The itinerary in fact focuses more on hagiography, explaining how through the offices of their patron saint, the Lobbesian monks dispelled an atmosphere of false peace and brought true peace to the belligerent Flemings in its place. The operative principle of peacemaking was grace, communicated via the saint in triumphant spectacles and possible failures.

The author derides local systems of dispute settlement as temporary, mercenary, strategic, and inherently belligerent. In Flanders, the monks encountered a bellicose ethos in the form of urban vendettas. When the Flemish gathered to resolve disputes, they failed because they had "gathered not out of inclination (*animo*) but by arrangement (*conventu*): out of a boastful desire to show off, not in a disposition of peace."[86] At Oostwerke, the townspeople perjured themselves in order to receive the blood price for a relative's demise.[87] If they could not make a bargain, the Flemish returned all the more eagerly to pursuit of their revenge.[88]

The saint's arrival in the midst of such mercenary dispute settlements caused a sudden transformation. Ursmar's relics "brought back concord and peace, so that once they had completely thrown off the ransoms and oaths (*exfestucatis redemptionibus et sacramentis*) made among themselves, when peace was sworn (*jurata pace*) on the [saint's] body, they discarded their arms and rushed to kiss one another."[89] Sudden inversions of feeling demonstrated

86. *MSU* 2.12, 573: "Convenerant non animo sed conventu: jactantia se ostendandi, non *pacis* affectu."

87. *MSU* 2.12, 573: "Nulla tamen pejor res interfuit, quam cupido: quia hic vult vendere mortem fratris, ille se defendere sacramento, dum mavult omnino se pejerare, quam thesaurum suum dissipare."

88. *MSU* 2.12, 573: "Itaque alii *sacramenta* accipiendo, alii decem libras, alii viginti, alii triginta, alii centum, et eo amplius deponendo, divisi sunt ea die, redituri in crastino; ut si non interveniret concordia, ardentior fieret ultionis repetitio" (emphasis added).

89. *MSU* 2.12, 573: "Ad tantam subito revocavit concordiam et pacem, ut omnino exfestucatis inter se redemptionibus et sacramentis, supra corpus jurata pace, ad oscula currerent, projectis armis."

externally were a feature of medieval negotiation and played a part in the social ordering of elite laymen and clerics alike.[90] In the above description, the juxtaposition of the terms *exfestucatio* and *jurare* suggests the renunciation of one bond or contract in favor of another.[91] *Exfestucare* comes from a lay discourse of feuding, supporting Stephen White's suggestion that representations of dispute rely on embedded tropes shared by clergy and knights.[92] But beyond gestures these performances were the end result of lasting internal processes, carried out through divine grace: "nulli posset esse dubium interfuisse gratiam Sancti Spiritus."[93] The metamorphosis emphasized the contrast between true and false peace, a lasting peace based on love of the saint and one's enemies versus a shaky facsimile constructed from blood price, petty revenge, and ambition.[94]

In an atmosphere ridden with long-standing grievances, the Lobbesians repeatedly exposed Flemish compromise processes as mercenary, diabolical, and inherently violent. At the same time they demonstrated that a binding concord required the acceptance of grace through a drastic change in loves and loyalties. Since this message must be read into the scriptural and sacramental allusions behind some dramatic episodes of reconciliation, the Lobbesian account seems to show the monks manipulating local populations. Geoffrey Koziol says the Lobbesians attempted to mediate quarrels

---

90. Fredric Cheyette and Howell Chickering, "Love, Anger and Peace: Social Practice and Poetic Play in the Ending of *Yvain*," *Speculum* 80.1 (2005), 104–112. Stephen D. White, "The Politics of Anger," in *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages*, ed. Barbara Rosenwein (Ithaca, NY, 1998), 150: "However one explains the striking similarities between the feuding culture of the Benedictine monks and that of the noble kin groups from which the monks were recruited, the emotional shifts that Bloch read as evidence of 'emotionalism' seem to have been encoded as deeply in the former as they were in the latter."

91. Jacques Le Goff, "The Symbolic Ritual of Vassalage," *Time, Work, and Culture in the Middle Ages*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Chicago, 1980; fr. orig. 1977), 245–248, argues that while the *festuca* (a stick) had a complex symbolism (including power and uncultivated earth) when transferred during the ceremony of investiture, its erstwhile reversal *exfestucatio* was not always executed ceremonially but could simply refer to a breaking off of homage.

92. See White, "Politics of Anger," 150.

93. The full quotation regarding a transformation at Blaringhem, *MSU* 1.6, 572: "Tanta pietas irrepsit omnium cordibus, ut nulli posset esse dubium interfuisse gratiam Sancti Spiritus." At the peace council of Bergues, *MSU* 2.9, 572: "Facta est mentio concordiarum et *pacis* in omnium audientia: recitatum etiam quanta in his eo itinere sibi affuisset divinitus gratia."

94. Cf. Bonnaud-Delamare, *L'idée de paix*, 38: "[Augustine dit] La paix de la cité terrestre est fondée sur le désir de dominer et sur la guerre. Au contraire la paix de la Cité de Dieu est fondée sur la charité."

through performance, specifically ceremonies that brought the townspeople into close, personal contact, with a view toward isolating dissenters and aligning them with the pacified community by means of ritualized, mutually comprehensible gestures.[95] In fact, far from exposing monastic interaction ritual, this self-conscious and carefully constructed text has no place for mediation: the quarrels themselves fade in importance as the narrative progresses, ceding place to the grace required for efficacious reception of peace. Read as hagiography and as an indictment of false peace in Flanders, the narrative of Ursmar's miracles is a monopolistic claim to a particular vision of peace, reliant on transformations of the will and modeled on sacramental action.

The point of the narrative is made fairly early, when the author describes the incident at Strazeele. On the face of it, a ritual circle was formed; a dog polluted the ritual; peacemaking failed. Failure is the obvious assessment of the episode when peacemaking is treated as a ceremonial process, whose goal was the cessation of hostilities.[96] However, we may read the story differently, especially since the author begins with it in an attempt to set the tone.[97] The loss of adherents at Strazeele did not diminish the peacemaking. Like Christ's apostles, when their peace was not accepted by the unworthy, the monks shook the dust off their feet and moved on.

The author of the *Miracula sancti Ursmari* describes the dog not as matter out of place but as *diaboli stropha*, the trickery or artifice of the devil: profane but very much a part of the demonstration.[98] Faced with recalcitrant townspeople, Ursmar provoked the devil to emerge as the real reason for discord. The incident echoes Gregory the Great's warning in the *Homilies on Ezekiel* that when the vision of peace becomes most apparent, the devil will redouble his efforts against it. Gregory explains this with an example from Mark's

95. Koziol, "Monks, Feuds, and the Making of Peace," 249–255.

96. According to Koziol, at least one factor in this failure was the presence of the profane element: the dog. He also suggests that the townspeople may not have been familiar with the saint. The sequence of Ursmar's miracles then takes on a progressive mode, as the monks gradually establish their authority and legitimacy in Flanders through later, "successful" acts of peacemaking. "Monks, Feuds, and the Making of Peace," 254.

97. The sequence of episodes need not match the monks' itinerary; in fact, if it did, they must have proceeded in a zig-zag fashion through the kingdom.

98. *MSU* 1.5, 571.

gospel: when Christ exorcised demons from a possessed man, the demons raged all the more fiercely before they were defeated.[99]

Of course, if the peacemaking event at Strazeele had been a simple exorcism, Ursmar still would have failed, since he did not expel the demon but only forced him to appear. But the confrontation can also be compared to a sacrament that accomplished what it was supposed to: signify the presence of divine grace and offer participants a choice—in this case, between the saint's peace and the illusory and fatal peace of local conciliation practices. The saint's elevation had offered the unwilling combatants a chance for transformation, but because their commitment was not strong enough, the devil's beast led them away.[100]

Tertullian, who may have coined the term *sacramentum*, intended it as he did words like *corona* (martyr's wreath): as military terminology to emphasize Christians' loyalty to an encampment diametrically opposed to a Roman world ruled by the devil. Even as world and church came together under the Christian emperors, *sacramenta* retained the connotations of military oaths and insignia. At opposite ends of the town square of Strazeele, Ursmar's arrival and the devil's response made these ultimate choices immediate and visible. Despite its seeming incompleteness, the peace of Strazeele achieved everything that a sacrament was supposed to do. While it came from the devil, the discordant dog of Strazeele indicted not the gift of peace but only those whose conversion to peace was not genuine. Its followers were marked as "dogs returning to their vomit," Gregory the Great's term for apostates and Raoul Glaber's for those who abjured their oaths of peace.[101] The dog therefore completed the sacrament, which was meant to select those who were worthy, and condemn the unworthy. It reinforced the boundary between friends and opponents of peace that began with the circle. Via circle and dog, saint and devil offered mirror sacraments.

---

99. Gregory, *Homiliae in Hiezechihelem prophetam* 1.12.24, ed. Marcus Adriaen, CCSL 142:197: "Sed mox ut animus amare caelestia coeperit, mox ut ad visionem pacis intimae tota se intentione scollegerit, antiquus ille adversarius qui de caelo lapsus est invidet, et insidiari amplius incipit. . . . Quid et enim quod obsessum hominem antiquus hostis quem possessum non discerpserat, deserens discerpsit, nisi quod plerumque dum de corde expellitur, acriores in eo tentationes generat, quam prius excitaverat quando hoc quietus possidebat?" Cf. Mark 9.25. This association of peacemaker with exorcist carried into the twelfth century, when the scriptural exegete Geoffrey Babion described Solomon, literally the peaceful one, as a king who simultaneously made peace and expelled demons. Babion (*sub voce* Anselm of Laon), *Enarrationes in Evangelium Matthaei* 1, PL 162:1241D and 12:1361A.

100. *MSU* 1.5, 571: "assenserunt quidam, licet inviti, pro timore Dei et Sancti amore: minor autem pars omnino coepit contraire. . . . Quibus etiam ducatum suum non subtraxit."

101. See Glaber, *Histories* 4.5.17, 196–198.

The peacemaking process was therefore destructive, condemning to death those unworthy of peace. But for the worthy too it was turbulent and traumatic. In Lissewegge, a youth named Robert foamed at the mouth, rolled on the ground, and ate dirt before he submitted to the power of the saint and pardoned the murderer of his kin. Historians of medieval disputes emphasize how extravagant emotional displays were a part of the reconciliation strategy.[102] As the Lobbesians saw it, wailing and gnashing of teeth were not strategy but conversion in the Augustinian sense: peace was a gift of grace, a gift that, once accepted, transformed the senses, reforming pleasure itself. "You need not be drawn to God by force," as Augustine said. "One is also drawn by pleasure."[103] But such a transformation of pleasure did not take place without tremendous internal struggle. Once individual antagonists began to change, their companions (*amici*) followed, surrendering themselves to the saint. In Blaringhem, as the local strongman, Hugo, worked to forgive his enemy, "tears flowed from the eyes of everyone: piety and ire wrestled in the hearts of our people." With "miraculous signs, Ursmar finally won, grabbing (*perstringens*) the minds and countenances (*aspectus*) of everyone."[104]

Written most likely at the end of the eleventh century, the *Miracles of Saint Ursmar* anticipates several discourses of peace that will be treated in this book, notably those of the papal reform and the more abstruse but equally pertinent scholastic association of peace with the human will. Twelfth-century theologians of peace dwelled long on the necessity of conflict, and its inevitable association with the peacemaking process. In his spectrum of true and false peace, Anselm of Laon placed most human beings within a field of salutary conflict whereby reason tussled with carnality in order to restore peace in the human psyche. Guibert of Nogent interpreted God's separation of heaven and earth at the beginning of Genesis to mean that in "those who lived well," spirit and flesh must remain not friends but enemies.

---

102. Patrick Geary, "Humiliation of the Saints," in *Living with the Dead*, 109; White, "Politics of Anger," 127–152; and Richard E. Barton, "Zealous Anger and the Renegotiation of Aristocratic Relationships," in Rosenwein, *Anger's Past*, 153–170.

103. Augustine, *In Iohannis evangelium tractatus* 26.4, ed. Augustine Mayer and R. Willems, CCSL 36: 261 (henceforth *Tr. in J.*): "Ego dico: parum est voluntate, etiam voluptate traheris. . . . Noli te cogitare invitum trahi; trahitur animus et amore."

104. *MSU* 1.6, 571: "Fluebant lacrymae ab oculis omnium: pugnabant pietas et ira in cordibus nostrorum" (suggesting this struggle takes place among those already saved); and 3.16, 574: "Tandem vincit S. Ursmarus, et mirabili signo perstringens omnimum animos et aspectus [. . .] fecit se levari citius."

Hugh of Saint-Victor made turbulent emotional transformation the cornerstone of spiritual discipline, an integral stage in the process of redemption.[105] To teach the self to reinterpret sensory stimuli became the goal of peacemaking, exemplified by monastic disciplinary activities: a process of cultivating discernment through pain and humiliation, so that what was once bitter now tasted sweet; tears of anger and hatred became tears of love. The goal was not to keep the monks in line but to transform sensation and correct judgment as a precondition of quiescence. The target was the human will, which must be liberated from a lassitude imposed by superficial pleasures.[106]

Likely written just a few decades earlier, the Lobbesian account describes the same process in reverse: the monks exported discipline to the Flemish knights simply by offering Ursmar's peace, which acted as a stimulus to incredible internal conflict and self-loathing. Horrific resistance like Robert's preceded sudden and complete changes in attitude.[107] These displays of rage, remorse, and reconciliation were the external signs of internal disciplining, just as the newly renounced conflicts and compromises had been the signs of internal disorder.

The Lobbesians constructed their vision of peacemaking in Flanders not at the height of their influence but likely during a time of institutional weakness and embarrassment.[108] In such a position, peace offered an intangible yet compelling claim to authority, especially over laypersons, who may well have treated their monastic visitors with a mixture of apathy and amusement. Members of a once-glorious house, the Lobbesians were willing to relinquish their own transformative authority to God and his saints. They activated fraternal charity to produce a quasi-sacramental process, one that detached the church from those who were too tainted for its peace.

Even if in reality the Lobbesian monks were unable to effect a major social and religious reordering, they had honed a language of claims over the loves

105. See chapter 5. Although Hugh was a canon, at least one treatise on transformed sensation was first delivered to a monastic audience, suggesting that such distinctions did not deter him from prescribing behavior for other church professions. See *De archa Noe* 1.1–1.2, ed. Patrice Sicard and Dominique Poirel, CCCM 176:3–8; also *Archa* 3.2.56.

106. Hugh reminded his audience that transformations of sensation that ended in delight all required a degree of turbulence: fear, and often violence, accompanied the processes of conversion, redemption, and salvation before the mind could discover "the quiet of internal peace." Hugh, *Archa* 3.2.56: "Sopito deinde terrenorum desideriorum strepitu, continuo mens ad quietem interne *pacis* componitur."

107. *MSU* 3.16, 574.

108. A few decades after the *delatio*, when Saint Peter's church was built, the Lobbesians turned its protection over to the powerful bishop Otbert of Liège, allowing him to establish his own men in positions of authority, and allying themselves with him as he began a vigorous upheaval of nearby monasteries.

and loyalties of all persons, whether lay or clerical. By assailing lay mimicry of peace the Lobbesian monks had claimed their share of a growing clerical exceptionalism. The *Miracles of Saint Ursmar* displays the beginnings of clerical self-consciousness mingled with a cautious, half-winking attempt to examine lay society through its "fighting ways." By relocating the battlefield from the churches and town squares to the antagonists' hearts, the Lobbesian chronicler turned conventional representations of negotiation into theologically charged images. Pugnacious conflict resolution marked the alien and the primitive, a distinct culture that begged for observation, analysis, and amelioration. Its alternative was true peace, an often painful but lasting emotional transformation to liberate the self from the captivity of mercenary oaths and foolish pacts.

By 1000, monks and bishops had crafted a collective identity that negotiated between detachment from worldly attractions and necessary engagement in local politics. Clerical visions of peace took on the characteristics of the dominant peacemakers: local bishops in the south, lay lords in Burgundy, Lotharingian metropolitans, impoverished and nostalgic monks from Hainault. To defend the peace of their churches, monks like John of Gorze and Richard of St. Vanne crossed thresholds between altar and marketplace. In order to do this safely, they had to cultivate peace within themselves, as exemplary pastors who could balance the draws of reason and carnality. Reformers of a subsequent generation did not always consider their efforts a success. Richard appeared in a dream before the hermit Peter Damian, himself a guiding spirit of reform in Pope Leo IX's curia. The late abbot of St. Vanne was not enjoying his afterlife, condemned to hell for excessive worldliness, forced to set up scaffolding after scaffolding; to pay for a lifetime of vainglorious building projects, Richard had now been set to fortifying castles.[109] Such images revealed the dangerously narrow line that reformers walked, and the ease with which they could turn on one another in the name of ecclesiastical and spiritual amelioration.

The first quarter of the eleventh century also marks a concerted effort among bishops like Gerard of Cambrai and chroniclers like Glaber and Andrew of Fleury to present violence as an endemic condition, subject to clerical redress of one kind or another. Faced with rivals to his authority in Cambrai, Gerard developed a number of strategies, and based on Duby's work, we can identify three: delineation of good and bad oaths (*sacramenta*), selective sedition, and an overarching theology of peace that distinguished true from false.[110] The ambitions of the early experimenters with peace were

109. Bede K. Lackner, *The Eleventh-Century Background of Cîteaux* (Washington, DC, 1972), 99.

110. Duby, *Three Orders*, 23.

borne out at the highest levels of ecclesiastical authority, especially once Bishop Bruno of Toul took over in Rome as Pope Leo IX. Clerical obsessions with peace and violence would intensify during the papal-imperial conflict of the late eleventh century and the explosion of oath-based political associations (communes) in northern France and Italy. Under the clerical gaze, and its monopolistic assertions of true peace, sporadic conflict and conciliation among the laity would become part of a warning system, pointing to deeper-seated *violentia*.

Around the millennium a change is indeed apparent, but it must be recognized primarily as discursive: the emergence of great divergence and debate around the meaning of real peace. Early efforts to discredit or destabilize forms of inconvenient ("false") concord produced a vocabulary of resistance, in which false peace was equated with illicit oaths and captivation of the will. As the next two chapters demonstrate, this hostility to alternative or "false" forms of concord shaped not just the vocabulary but also the political policy of the later eleventh-century popes, like Gregory VII and Urban II. Ironically, while Gerard of Cambrai had raised the specter of false peace to privilege imperial authority over the peacemaking adventures of local bishops, during the papal-imperial controversy the same hatred of false peace shaped a radical challenge to empire. Like Gerard, Pope Gregory VII distinguished clearly between acceptable and unacceptable modes of peace; he saw these manifested in good and wicked bonds (*sacramenta*); and he promoted rebellion, the loss of social and political tranquility, in order to defend the true sacraments of the church against Henry IV and his imperial bishops.

CHAPTER 2

The Papal Reform

Peace Espoused and Repudiated

An anonymous *vita* begun during the final years of Pope Leo IX's life speaks of the young bishop Bruno of Toul's arrival in Rome in 1049. A kinsman of Emperor Henry III, the new pope had recently been ruling a diocese in Upper Lotharingia and had gained the highest clerical seat in Latin Christendom after a series of disputed and scandalous papal elections.[1] As he entered the city, a "handmaid of God" accosted him with the following instructions: upon crossing the "threshold of the apostles" he must say, "Peace to this house and all who dwell in it."[2] Her advice heralded the new pope's reform agenda, which would eventually divide papacy and empire.

1. Aside from Otto III, who had a dream of reviving Constantine's Roman Empire, the king-emperors of Germany largely allowed patrician families their way in Rome. The imperial policy of detachment ended when Henry III intervened after the tenure of the young Pope Benedict IX (1032–1045). Benedict's maladministration had led to calls for his removal, and two rivals, Silvester III and Gregory VI, claimed the papacy. Gregory VI, formerly John Gratian, prior of Saint-John-ante-Portam-Latinam, ruled for eighteen months (1045–1046), during which time he appeared to be an energetic reformer. Then, enemies said he had bribed his way into office, and Gregory either resigned or was deposed; he went into exile with his clerk, Hildebrand. Two German popes, Clement II (1046–1047) and Damasus II (1048), followed, but their tenures were short.

2. *Vita Leonis* 2.5, *La vie du Pape Léon IX (Brunon, évêque de Toul)*, ed. Monique Goullet and Michel Parisse (Paris, 1997), 76: "*Pax huic domui* et omnibus habitantibus in ea."

This chapter explores how papal visions of true peace quickly became implacable and produced an unprecedented radicalism in the tenor of church reform. Claiming to be bringing peace to Saint Peter's house, Leo and his advisers embarked on a process of cleansing and restructuring that became increasingly turbulent under his successors. Leo IX's papacy represents what one scholar has called a "watershed" in church reform. However, the young pope's own peacemaking borrowed heavily from the language of the Peace of God, and from projects of monastic reform that he and his Lotharingian fellow bishops had been carrying out for generations.[3] While ambitious in its visions the Leonine peace remained conservative in its methods, and solicitous of a harmonious relationship between papacy and empire. Reform needed the stewardship of Hildebrand, later Gregory VII, to truly radicalize it.
Unlike Leo, Gregory made no accommodation for a peace that differed from his own implacable vision, for to accede to any but the perfect peace was to acquiesce in captivity. Gregorian reformers and their opponents revived the specters of false peace exposed centuries before in the writings of Cyprian and Augustine. Churchmen saw false peace in the confusion of authority at the highest levels of the church, and consequently, in the disparagement and mimicry of sacraments. To them the world appeared tranquil but was inherently violent; the church needed forceful liberation from captivity.

Pope Leo IX's Protection of Peace

Once established in Rome, the energetic Leo assembled a council that included Humbert of Silva Candida and Hugh Candidus from the abbey of Remiremont, Lotharingians who brought the experience of an ecclesiastical revival in which powerful bishops had imposed an apostolic mode of conduct on monks.[4] In Lotharingia, this reform had also taken the name of peace; Bruno's friend and neighbor Adalbero III of Metz is described in the

3. Uta-Renate Blumenthal, *The Investiture Controversy: Church and Monarchy from the Ninth to the Twelfth Century* (Philadelphia, 1988), 70. For Cluniac influence, see Hans-Werner Goetz, "Protection of the Church, Defense of the Law, and Reform: On the Purposes and Character of the Peace of God, 989–1038," in *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000*, ed. Thomas Head and Richard Landes (Ithaca, NY, 1992), 273–277.

4. Blumenthal, *Investiture Controversy*, 73, argues: "The once-convincing thesis that church reform was an import from Lotharingia is no longer tenable." It is true that the cisalpine Peter Damian presaged the Lotharingians' desire to restore spiritual primacy to the Holy See. However, these ideas came to fruition only under the Lotharingian *curia*.

Gesta episcoporum Mettensium as "a lover of peace and restorer of monasteries."[5] Bruno's monastic policy typically involved the deposition of incumbent abbots and the grouping of leaderless houses under a single abbot. Reform popes after Leo continued his policy of centralizing governance by disrupting interfraternal bonds and local authority.[6]

Leonine reformers envisaged a church patterned on the perfect balance of spirit and flesh in Christ.[7] They maintained the peace of the church by targeting three abuses: simony (the acquisition of holy offices through sale), nicolaitism (clerical marriage and concubinage), and canonically invalid diocesan appointments (i.e., those made without the general approval of clergy and laity). Simony represented an essential problem that had confronted early Christian leaders: that of making peace with the world. It meant the incursion of temporal concerns, politics, wealth, and patronage into the spiritual church. The simoniac upset the balance between piety and governance in the church, subordinating spiritual concerns to material distractions. Nicolaitism was also a threat to the proper separation of orders in society, since those who prayed must be distinguished from other social orders by their celibacy.[8] Finally, canonical validity meant that a diocese must be able to elect its own leaders, selected by the clergy and with popular approval.[9] According to the pope's biographer, Bruno's own election at Toul exemplified canonical validity.[10]

Clerical abuses had long concerned the church, and the assault on them had social and political implications. Unpopular leaders could be accused as

---

5. *Gesta episcoporum Mettensium* 49, ed. D. G. Waitz, MGH *SS* 10:543: "pacis amator et coenobiarum reparator." We get some hint of Adalbero's movements in Metz when the chronicler mentions that he expanded the church of the city by means of his own estates (*prediis suis*). The reference to Adalbero as peacemaker is thanks to I.S. Robinson, ed. and trans., *The Papal Reform of the Eleventh Century: Lives of Pope Leo IX and Pope Gregory VII* (Manchester, 2004), 102n.

6. *Vita Leonis* 1.12, 44–46.

7. See Georges Duby, "The Laity and the Peace of God," *The Chivalrous Society*, trans. Cynthia Postan (Berkeley, 1977), 123–133.

8. Amy G. Remensnyder, "Pollution, Purity, and Peace: An Aspect of Social Reform between the Late Tenth Century and 1076," in Head and Landes, *Peace of God*, 282, 294–298, and 306–307. See discussion below.

9. *Vita Leonis* 2.6, 78. And see *Vita Leonis* 1.8, 28, for Bruno's attention to the edict when he was elected bishop. Cf. Celestine, *Epistolae* 2, PL 4:466–467.

10. Eager to enlarge the fortunes of his cousin, Emperor Conrad II balked at confining Bruno to a lowly diocese like Toul. However, when clergy and people insisted on the appointment, Bruno humbled himself in order to ensure that his appointment was canonically valid and bereft of any trace of simony. *Vita Leonis* 1.8–10, 26–38.

simoniacs and forcibly ejected from office.[11] Eradication of simony disciplined the clergy, but it also allowed the new papal government to mitigate the nepotism by which Tusculan and Crescentian dynasties had ruled Roman ecclesiastical politics. In a domino effect, the chastisement of simoniacs discredited the sacraments of any clergy they had ordained. In his first synodal decree the pope in fact tried to remove priests who had been ordained by simoniacs, but compromised when informed that such sweeping changes would bring services to a halt in Rome.[12]

The paradigm of a papal reformer, Leo laid the groundwork for the centralization of papal government. The eagerness of the pope and his successors to disengage the appointment of bishops from imperial or lay noble patronage strengthened the connections between bishoprics and the papacy.[13] Leo also overhauled the papal chancery, adopting northern European scribal customs and creating a documentary style that had imperial influences.[14] He created safeguards for the maintenance of separate codes of conduct appropriate to knights and priests. Leo held synods that extended the Peace of God movement beyond its home in the southwest of France. He returned to the Rhineland to propagate a vision of monastic and clerical peace, bringing the papacy literally face-to-face with transalpine Christian subjects by adjudicating local disputes and performing miracles.[15] His journey may even have been one of the models for the account of the relic tour of Lobbes, discussed

11. In 1069, canons in Constance appealed on these grounds to Pope Alexander II and removed the royal appointee bishop Charles, one of a series of removals that culminated in the events collectively known as the Investiture Controversy. H. E. J. Cowdrey, *Gregory VII* (Oxford, 1998), 87–88. The unpopular bishop Otbert Liège, appointed by Henry in 1092, was similarly accused of simony, but though excommunicated by Urban II, he could not be removed from office. Louis Brigué, *Alger de Liége: Un théologien de l'Eucharistie au début du XIIe siècle* (Paris, 1936), 5–6.

12. Some years after the pope's death, Humbert of Silva Candida declared that any sacraments administered by simoniacs were heretical, imperfect, and therefore invalid. Although Peter Damian strongly opposed this view, the question of the objective validity of simoniac and heretical sacraments was not fully settled until the middle of the twelfth century. Blumenthal, *Investiture Controversy*, 74–76.

13. Blumenthal notes that as early as 1049 Leo had begun to incorporate cardinal-bishops from the suburbicarian sees around Rome into the papal government. Blumenthal, *Investiture Controversy*, 76–77.

14. Blumenthal, *Investiture Controversy*, 78–79.

15. Ibid., 73. Book 2 of the *Vita Leonis noni* is largely devoted to the pope's travels in Lotharingia, where he mediates between antagonists and performs miracles. While the style of description is hagiographical, it is most likely an embellishment on actual travels by Leo in familiar transalpine territory. For the extent of this pattern of rule before the Henrician-Gregorian "monarchies," see John W. Bernhardt, *Itinerant Kingship and Royal Monasteries in Early Medieval Germany, c. 936–1075* (Cambridge, 1993). In the early twelfth century, King Louis the Fat of France still ruled by traveling from castle to castle.

in the previous chapter. Concerns once apparent among eleventh-century promoters of the Peace of God were now being enshrined in papal decrees.

Amy Remensnyder has argued that at stake in both the Peace of God movement and Leo's reform was a "peace which bound Christians together to form one mystical-social body, one church. This peace was engendered by the bonds of charity between human beings."[16] Leo's curial adviser Humbert of Silva Candida agonized over the violence that clerical abuses had inflicted on this body.[17] In the doctrines of Leo's papal reform, prelates were urged to "change from *raptores* to *pastores* of their churches." Contraventions of peace included the resistance of clergymen to three defining attributes of their order: chastity, moral purity, and renunciation of arms. Those clerics slow to reform constituted pollution to the body of Christ and a threat to the social peace obtained in the communion of the church.[18]

While Leo's edicts emphasized the centrality of local clergy and laity to the election of prelates, they continued to acknowledge (or refrained from denying) imperial authority over ecclesiastical appointments. Thus, even though Leo IX led a disastrous military expedition against the Sicilians shortly before his death, the adventurous pope's memory remained that of a peacemaker and reformer—most likely because he never overtly challenged the German emperor's right to be "Lord of Peace."[19] As apostolic peacekeeper, Leo provided only the clerical or sacerdotal counterpart to ecclesiastical reforms that Henry had demanded as early as 1046. The two rulers complemented one other to form a "cornerstone of concord between *regnum* and *sacerdotium*." This concord was the "Peace of God" that imperial partisans would espouse in the face of future papal expansionism.[20]

---

16. Remensnyder, "Pollution, Purity, and Peace," 294.

17. Ibid., 293. Remensnyder shows linkages between language used to describe poor episcopal administration and that used to describe the "violence and devastation caused by the enemies of the peace." Equivalent penalties (excommunication) for clerical and lay abuses that were very different in nature suggest how simoniacal or unchaste priests could be imagined to constitute a threat to peace (292).

18. Remensnyder, "Pollution, Purity, and Peace," 294–298 and 306–307. As Remensnyder explains, "Peace was not a particular social order but the right order," systematization and correct placement of "groups composing the *corpus christianorum*," so as to maintain the unity and purity of the body of Christ (282).

19. See Blumenthal, *Investiture Controversy*, 70–81, for an account of Leo's IX tenure and reforms.

20. Sigebert of Gembloux, *Epistola Leodicensium adversus Paschalem Papam* 11, MGH LDL 2:462 (henceforth *EL*): "Nisi *pax* Dei, quae exuperat omnem sensum, copulet regnum et sacerdotium uno angulari lapide concordiae, vacillabit structura ecclesiae super fidei fundamentum." Cowdrey says: "In the years which followed the changes and controversies of the crisis years from 1044–1049, Leo and Henry generally established themselves in the eyes of posterity as a paradigm pope and emperor." Cowdrey, *Gregory VII*, 25.

Leo's peacemaking nevertheless contained the seeds of a future split with the imperial vision of peace. As it evolved, the assault on simony effectively emasculated the Salian emperors by denying them a crucial means of making powerful alliances. His insistence on canonical election bore fruit in Pope Nicholas II's provocatively worded Election Decree of 1059, which stated that while cardinal bishops of Rome would choose the new pope, with the agreement of cardinal priests and the assent of the Roman clergy and people, the emperors were merely "conceded" their traditional participation. Perhaps unbeknownst to the emperor, Leo was also experimenting with a papal reinterpretation of the Roman *pax*. It emerged in his dealings with the Greek church, for centuries an opponent over "Judaized" or improper understandings of ritual. The pope wanted to pacify Peter's domain in the broadest terms: not just Italy and the empire but the extreme eastern and western portions of today's Europe. In 1049 Leo and his advisers criticized Michael Kerularios, patriarch of Constantinople, over the Greeks' proscription of azymes (unleavened bread) in the Eucharist. The papal legate Humbert of Silva Candida insisted that the eastern empire conform instead to the Roman dogma and practice of the sacrament, a controversy that then extended to theological differences over *filioque* (the procession of the Holy Spirit from Father and Son) and an ecclesiological impasse over papal primacy. As he had with clerical abuses, Humbert invoked violations of Christ's body. The Greeks were distorting the body of the church: "The composition of body and members teaches us in what way and how much the unity of the church should be maintained [and] if a member does not fulfill its office but desires to usurp that of another (*praeripere alienum*), it will the disrupt (*conturbat*) the entire order of the body."[21] Although a Pauline image of unity and coordination, the head-body metaphor originated in the rhetoric of the Roman Empire and conveyed the *Pax Romana*.[22] Under Leo, a harmonious body meant the papacy's primacy over all other priests and churches, thus ensuring the unity and integrity of the Christian world.

Leo's reform circle sustained men like the Lotharingian Humbert, who were ready to take extreme and aggressive positions in order to render the papal vision of peace. The Italians who joined Leo's curia, Peter Damian and Hildebrand, similarly privileged disruptive processes in the name of reform.

---

21. Leo IX, *Epistolae*, no. 100, PL 143:767, the letter most likely written by Humbert. I thank Brett Whalen for directing my attention to this letter.

22. On the perfection of the church understood as the *building up* of Christ's body in Carolingian thought, see Karl F. Morrison, *The Mimetic Tradition of Reform in the West* (Princeton, NJ, 1982), 155.

In their case disruption was disciplinary, aimed at emotional and spiritual liberation of Christians who had subjugated their own desires to the delusions of the world. Rendered in broad strokes, such attitudes might be called "monastic" or "ascetic," but they had wildly differing goals. Damian targeted reform inward as amelioration of the self, a subject to which we will return in later chapters. Hildebrand understood reform as insurrection: specifically, forceful liberation of the church from the captivity of a dangerous and misguided peace with empire. As Pope Gregory VII, Hildebrand presented a defense of insurrection, insisting that churchmen engage in salutary conflict, since the church could not afford its present state of peace.

The Gregorian Defense of Insurrection

In 595 B.C., Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, invaded Jerusalem and carried the royal house of David into exile. As captive Israelites dreamed of liberation, God warned the prophet Ezekiel not to desire too hasty a recovery of Jerusalem.[23] Ezekiel had a vision of an eagle that plucked the highest branch of the cedar of Lebanon and carried it to a merchant city. It then planted some seeds to produce a low-statured vine. When a second eagle flew by, the vine turned its roots to the newcomer, hoping to be transplanted again:

> Shall it prosper? Shall he not pull up the roots thereof, and cut off the fruit thereof, that it wither? (Ezek. 17.9)

The vision referred to the fate of Zedekiah. After conquering Jerusalem, Nebuchadnezzar obtained an oath of fealty from the Israelite king Jehoachin, and then exiled him and his court to Babylon. Meanwhile a puppet government was installed under Zedekiah (Mattanyahu), who then betrayed Nebuchadnezzar's trust by making overtures to Babylon's enemy Egypt. If Zedekiah had hoped for the pharaoh's support against Babylon, he was disappointed. In retaliation for the betrayal, Nebuchadnezzar descended a second time on Jerusalem, destroyed the city, razed the Temple, and deported all the inhabitants. Zedekiah fled, blinded and bereft of companions, only for the Babylonians to catch and execute him.

God explained the vision and then warned:

> Seeing [Zedekiah] despised the oath by breaking the covenant, when he had given his hand . . . he shall not escape. (Ezek. 17.18)

23. See the introduction for a corresponding vision.

Medieval readers received an explanation of Ezekiel 17 through Saint Jerome's gloss on the Vulgate; and it was eventually enshrined in the twelfth-century *Glossa ordinaria*. The vision of secession from Babylon became a moral fable about the danger of broken oaths, or as medieval readers specified, violated sacraments. Defiled oaths constituted violence at its most basic, a subversion of love between ruler and subject, friend and friend, humanity and God. Zedekiah and Nebuchadnezzar became tropes for the ambiguities of rulership on earth, where good persons must pledge obedience to wicked princes.[24]

For medieval Christians, Jerusalem, meaning "vision of peace," referred to an idea more than a place: the promise of a future celestial kingdom, in which there was no need for laws and all community conformed to the harmony of the angels. Human beings received only glimpses of this kingdom: for example, in the peace and community of monasteries. But for the most part they had to imagine it against its obverse, the fallibility and coercion of earthly government. Christians had long accepted that while they sojourned on earth, a perfect kingdom would be denied them, and that they would have to suffer good as well as wicked rulers.[25] Their religious faith would be manifest not only in the sacraments of the church but also in the oaths (*sacramenta*) that bound subjects to the kings that God had given the world "in his anger."[26] The alternative was anarchy and destruction, such as the Israelites had suffered after Zedekiah's betrayal of his Babylonian overlord.

By 1073, when Archdeacon Hildebrand assumed the title Pope Gregory VII, reformers in the papacy had shown themselves willing to take that risk, to rescind what they considered to be unjust, secular bonds in favor of the church's sacraments. Extreme solicitude for pristine and authentic sacraments fueled the Gregorian reform, exemplified by the pope's insistence on obedience free from the constraints of secular oaths. Gregory insisted on the mutual incompatibility of ecclesiastical and nonecclesiastical sacraments and demanded that Christian subjects renounce any bonds (including royal ones) if they detracted from obedience to the heirs of Saint Peter.

---

24. On the subject of obedience to earthly power, see Philippe Buc, *L'ambiguïté du livre: Prince, pouvoir, et peuple dans les commentaires de la Bible au Moyen Âge*, Théologie Historique, ser. 95 (Paris, 1994), 246–311.

25. See chapter 2. For a detailed articulation of this position during the Investiture Controversy, see Sigebert, *EL* 2:449–464.

26. Hosea 13.11; Gregory the Great, *Moralia in Job* 25.16.34, ed. Marcus Adriaen, CCSL 143B:1260; Sigebert, *EL* 10:462.

A former monk, Hildebrand resembled the fiery Humbert of Silva Candida in temperament. Dutiful to the point of personal disgrace, he had reluctantly accompanied his master, the reform-minded John Gratian (Pope Gregory VI) into exile, after the latter was deposed on charges of simony.[27] Bonizo of Sutri places him among the Cluniacs during Pope Leo's journey to the Holy See; apparently, the young Hildebrand scolded the new pope for his princely robes and shamed him into approaching the gates of Rome as a penitent.[28] This story has little basis in reality, serving instead to forge an early association between Gregory and the pope he claimed as an exemplar. It does, however, reflect the impression Hildebrand made on friends and foes alike, of a man who would not hesitate to rebuke princes of church and world in the interest of a higher truth. This was not a man to countenance the customary prerogatives of the German monarchs if those customs defiled the sacraments.

Hildebrand returned to Rome during Leo's papacy, and for the next two decades he served as a legate, as rector of the church of Saint Paul beyond the Walls, and, in 1060, as archdeacon. In this latter capacity, he achieved great prominence, especially during the tenure of Pope Alexander II. Both as archdeacon and as pope, Hildebrand-Gregory expanded reform to include the disruption of all wicked concords between world and church. Unlike Leo, who had resisted direct attacks on imperial prerogatives, Gregory fought to liberate the church from the hegemony of emperors, and to enhance at their expense the ecclesiastical and political governance of clerical leaders. To liberate heavenly Jerusalem from exile under earthly Babylon, laymen—even kings and emperors—must be forbidden from making ecclesiastical appointments. The pope regularly admonished and even excommunicated King Henry IV for the bad friendships that drove such investitures. Yet Gregory's opponents invoked against him Ezekiel 17 and reminded the pope's supporters about God's awful pronouncement on Zedekiah. Was the church ever meant to emerge from exile, to rule on earth in place of flawed and wicked

27. Blumenthal, *Investiture Controversy*, 56–57. Though a supporter of Hildebrand-Gregory, Bonizo of Sutri nonetheless has harsh words for the man young Hildebrand followed into exile: at best, John Gratian was simple (bribes had been paid for his election but without his knowledge), but he opened the door for extraordinary measures, when a layman was made pope in the interim following his resignation. Hildebrand followed only out of loyalty as John's chaplain. Bonizo of Sutri, *Liber ad amicum* 5, ed. Ernst Dümmler, MGH LDL 1:584–587. While announcing the excommunication of King Henry IV by the Synod of 1080, Gregory noted that he had followed his master Gregory VI "reluctantly." Gregory VII, *Item excommunicatio regis Henrici*, in *Pontificum Romanorum vitae*, ed. J. M. Watterich (Leipzig, 1862), 303.

28. Bonizo, *Liber ad amicum* 5, 587.

kings? Until the death of the world, should Jerusalem, the vision of peace, not remain obscure?

The use of Ezekiel 17 betrays a general anxiety about the church's sojourn under the traditional rule of the German monarchs, and the attempts by leaders like Gregory to liberate it by any means necessary. Imperial hegemony had endured, at least nominally, since 800 when Pope Leo III crowned Charlemagne emperor and protector of the Western Roman Empire. The German king-emperors were defenders of Rome and the church; they had been granted the power of the sword as well as the authority to reform liturgy, safeguard dogma, and generally govern the society of the church. Significantly, however, these subordinations pertained only to temporal concerns, visible enemies and earthly society, not to the heavenly kingdom that they reflected. Limitations on imperial purview increased after Charlemagne's death. Roger Bonnaud-Delamare describes the brief and brilliant history of Carolingian notions of peace as they bifurcated into the peace of empire and church, while Karl Morrison argues that Carolingian ecclesiologists conceived of the church as a separate kingdom, and the emperor's job to maintain that separation to safeguard the church's peace and liberty.[29] On the other hand, as Gerd Tellenbach argues in his seminal treatment of the subject, by the middle of the eleventh century, papal reformers had conceived of liberty as a correct sequence of command and obedience, right order, with a church of sacraments and ministers ascendant over monarchical theocracy. No matter how gently it was done, therefore, any attempt by a monarch to pacify both empire and church must necessarily appear to Gregory and his circle as unlawful bondage and a violation of peace.[30]

It is difficult to estimate the ambitions of imperial peace between the ninth and eleventh centuries. Timothy Reuter suggests that the early Ottonians Otto I and Otto II acted more as mediators, keeping peace among friends and allies through personal intervention, the parceling out of land, and judicious episcopal appointments. Only with Otto III do we see ambitions

29. Roger Bonnaud-Delamare, *L'idée de paix à l'époche carolingienne* (Paris, 1939); Karl Morrison, *The Two Kingdoms: Ecclesiology in Carolingian Political Thought* (Princeton, NJ, 1964), 45–67.

30. Gerd Tellenbach, *Church, State, and Christian Society at the Time of the Investiture Contest*, trans. R. F. Bennett (Oxford, 1940; Ger. orig. 1936), argues that Gregorian reformers saw their work first and foremost as a struggle for liberty in the highest sense, to be achieved by the disentanglement of the sacramental church from lay monarchy.

toward any *Pax Romana* resembling the imperial vision put forth during the Investiture Controversy.[31] The early Salians, Conrad II and Henry III, did envision their peacemaking mandate to include reform of the church and papacy. Conrad intervened in Italy against Archbishop Aribert's domination over Milan. Henry, famous for defending the church against simony, ejected a failing archbishop at Ravenna and appointed Leo IX to the Holy See to end a series of corrupt and calamitous papal elections; the reformer Peter Damian hailed him in several letters as "ruler of peace."[32] His son, Henry IV, could not sustain this claim to peacemaking because of ill-advised episcopal appointments in Constance and the Reichenau that infuriated not only the papal curia but also clergy in southern Germany. Henrician notions of peace were largely reactionary, assertions of universal order and traditional prerogatives in the face of dissension from imperial princes and, most significantly, the competing universalism of Gregory VII's papacy.

Despite his sullied reputation, Henry IV aspired to the role of peacemaking monarch, correcting past mistakes by a series of responsible appointments made with clerical consultation, and eventually declaring an "imperial peace" across Germany.[33] Ian Robinson notes that "the most significant scriptural text" in Henry's letters to Pope Gregory is Ephesians 4.3: "Preserve the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace."[34] However, the problem lay in mutually incompatible definitions of a peaceful bond, an incompatibility that was exposed by a series of standoffs regarding imperial (and hence lay) authority over clergymen. In the face of papal criticism, Henrician polemicists articulated a vision of imperial peace that emphasized not reform so much as the consonance of *regnum* and *sacerdotium* (kingship and priesthood). While the claim had Carolingian echoes, it ignored the limits placed on royal power by Charlemagne's own churchmen and by the Synod

31. See Timothy Reuter, *Germany in the Early Middle Ages, c. 800–1056* (London, 1991), 215–216, for the early Ottonians as peacemakers. From the reign of Otto III, Rome began to feature much more prominently in the ideology of Frankish *imperium*, shaping, as Reuter puts it, "the duality of papacy and empire at the head of Latin Christendom" (278).

32. Ian S. Robinson, *Authority and Resistance in the Investiture Contest* (Manchester, 1978), 89.

33. Robinson, *Authority and Resistance*, 89–90, points out that many of the simoniacal appointments ascribed to Henry by his opponents were made during his minority.

34. Robinson, *Authority and Resistance*, 92.

of Paris in 829 and that of Meaux in 845.[35] In the Henrician version of this harmonious arrangement, the pope and clergy worked to cultivate the faith (*fides*) of all Christian subjects toward the monarch. With faith came the ability to form bonds of love and loyalty; thus the clergy were mediating a bond between Christians and the emperor just as they did between humanity and God.

The emperor relied heavily on these bonds. Since the decline of Carolingian *imperium* in the late ninth century, friendship or *amicitia* had become an essential pillar in the political policy of medieval German monarchs.[36] Kings of the Ottonian and Salian dynasties had appointed kinsmen and friends to bishoprics of the empire and exerted monarchical authority through personal love and alliance.[37] The binding principle of friendship was an oath, called *juramentum* or *sacramentum*, performed as a religious ceremony and protected by church sanctions. Politics through friendship had allowed power to devolve on bishops, who remained loyal in order to bolster their local authority by ideological association with the empire.[38] Strong emperors maintained sufficient hold on these princes of the church, but in 1056 the empire went into crisis when the sudden death of Henry III left an infant on the throne. By the time the son Henry became king in his own right, Saxony and Swabia had drifted out of imperial control, and the young man needed to aggressively appoint friends to bishoprics. A pope who opposed this system of politics posed a threat to Henry's political survival.[39]

---

35. One might argue that in the eleventh century a radicalized imperial ideology defended long-standing administrative demarcations in the church. Morrison remarks on a reticence in Carolingian ecclesiology to confer on the emperor the kind of sacerdotal purview implied by late Salian polemic. Charlemagne arrogated to himself the authority to appoint and judge churchmen but with the recognition of limitations created by his status as a layman: "He intervened in ecclesiastical affairs, not on any principle of dominion over the Church . . . but rather on the premise that God had granted the imperial power to him 'not simply for the governance of the world, but most of all for the defense of the Church.'" Morrison, *Two Kingdoms*, 31. Thus the *rex et sacerdos* formula trumpeted by later German monarchs referred only to measures that secured the church's benefit in this world. On the limitations placed on lay royal power by the synods of Paris and Meaux, see Morrison, *Two Kingdoms*, 42–45.

36. See Gerd Althoff, *Heinrich IV* (Darmstadt, 2006), 32–40 and 288–302; and Althoff, *Otto III*, trans. Phyllis Jestice (University Park, PA, 2003; Ger. orig. 1996), 17–26. See also Althoff, *Family, Friends, and Followers: Political and Social Bonds in Medieval Europe*, trans. Christopher Carroll (Cambridge, 2004; Ger. orig. 1990), 117–135.

37. Blumenthal, *Investiture Controversy*, 106–110.

38. Cowdrey, *Gregory VII*, 78–80. See Reuter, *Germany*, 197–199, on an increase in the formalized and public nature of imperial episcopal appointments during the late Ottonian and early Salian period.

39. Blumenthal, *Investiture Controversy*, 106–113. Cowdrey, *Gregory VII*, 80.

A Tuscan of humble background, Gregory VII was socially detached from the imperial court, unlike many of the popes before him—and thus he cared little for the nuances of an emperor's friendship. Gregory labeled the friendships that bound Henry's earthly kingdom a *consortium* of the excommunicated and damned.[40] Gregory's biographer Paul of Bernried claims that flatterers had seduced the king with money and political authority: they "proposed with those things to which the human mind is accustomed to be fallible, namely the honor of rulership left by his father, his free choice, unlimited wealth, the abundance and strength of his soldiers." It was a concord of concupiscence.[41]

When Gregory assumed the papacy after Alexander's death, without consulting the imperial court, he insisted that the clergy and people of Rome had ratified his election, as was appropriate to the church canons. Far away in Aachen, King Henry was furious but made tentative attempts to remind the pope of long-standing relationships between empire and papacy. By 1075, a dispute over a key episcopal appointment in Milan had driven the two rulers apart and confirmed Henry's worst suspicions of the new pope. Meanwhile, bishops outside Rome were also finding their authority undermined by Gregory's support of local rebellions, his enthusiastic use of papal legates, and his insistence on Roman (i.e., Petrine) hegemony of the church. Furious letters crisscrossed the Alps, as the pope criticized the king for keeping company with excommunicated advisers, and Henry and the bishops urged the "sometime monk Hildebrand" to take his place in the nether regions of hell. Then, in 1076, Gregory excommunicated Henry for the first time, refused to accept him as king, and insisted that his subjects forsake him.[42] To clerical observers, the pope had kicked over the "cornerstone of concord" between kingship and priesthood, the essence of peace on earth.[43]

Friends of the empire protested that oaths once made to a ruler were sacrosanct: all *sacramenta* constituted earthly concord, regardless of the sinful nature of those who made them. In a polemic against Gregory, the Roman

---

40. Gregory VII, *Epistolae vagantes* 14 (Jaffé 4999) (henceforth *Ep. vag.*); Paul of Bernried, *Vita Gregorii papae* 78, in *Pontificum Romanorum vitae*, ed. J. M. Watterich (Leipzig, 1862), 520 (henceforth *Vita Greg.*): "separatus ab ecclesia in excommunicatorem consortio foret"; also 76, 516.

41. Paul, *Vita Greg.* 66, 510: "quibus humana mens falli solet, proposuerunt: regium videlicet honorem a patre dimissum, liberum arbitrium, opes infinitas, militum abundantiam et fortitudinem . . . "

42. For complete accounts of these events, see Blumenthal, *Investiture Controversy*; Colin Morris, *The Papal Monarchy: The Western Church from 1050–1250* (Oxford, 1989); Ian S. Robinson, *The Papacy, 1073–1198: Continuity and Innovation* (Cambridge, 1990).

43. Sigebert, *EL* 11, 462.

cardinal Beno of the churches of SS. Martin and Silvester contrasted Gregory's rebellion with the martyrdom of the Roman legion at Thebes, whose soldiers had accepted execution rather than raise arms against other Christians. The Thebans obeyed not only their sacrament to Christ but also the sacrament of pagan Caesar, since they preferred to die rather than mutiny.[44] As the Theban martyrs had shown, the morality of a prince should not determine whether or not his subjects fulfilled their political sacraments; and even sacraments to pagans must be honored.

Gregory responded that the semblance of peace the church currently enjoyed was untenable. The Gregorian reformers blamed peace for the church's decadence. Christian commitment to earthly tranquility had allowed lay princes to conspire with priests, who then acquired their sacramental office with bribes or offers of loyalty to kings rather than to Saint Peter. In this way, the royal power had secured for itself the means of coercion, heedless of the ecclesiastical oversight that enabled a kingdom to reflect Christ's rule in celestial Jerusalem. For papal supporters, real peace lay in the rupture of oaths to such a monarch. It meant rejection of the false sacraments offered by priests in a state of sin or disobedience. If social conflict were to break out as a result of repudiated oaths, that conflict was preferable to tranquility under hidden violence. Gregory knew chaos would follow his disavowal of "bad" sacraments.[45] In fact, he welcomed it, arguing that the devil would emerge only if forced, and that he could not be defeated until he emerged. In letters to his allies, the pope scorned backsliders who accepted enslavement to the devil.[46] Bloodshed may be just the tonic for a church that, no longer at war with the world, had been lulled by a superficial peace—peace without the promise of salvation.

In 1075, after several tense years, Pope Gregory and King Henry attacked one another openly over Henry's right to appoint an archbishop to the vacant see of Milan. Papal and imperial controversialists circulated letters and pamphlets

---

44. Beno, *Gesta Romanae aecclesiae contra Hildebrandum,* in *Contra decretum Hildebrandi* 3.3–4, ed. K. Francke, MGH LDL 2:382–383.

45. In 1050, Leo IX scaled back some of his reforms including the invalidation of any priest who had been ordained by a simoniac. He was warned of the anarchy this would create in local communities and acted accordingly. Gregory had less inclination toward tact or diplomacy.

46. In 1076, at the height of his conflict with Henry, Gregory wrote to a knight in Milan: "Ecce diabolus palam in mundo dominatur, ecce omnia membra sua se exaltasse laetatur." (See the devil clearly ruling in the world, see all his members rejoice at their exaltation.) Such an open exertion of diabolical authority could mean only that God would be coming to the aid of the "soldiers of Christ," since the history of persecutions showed that those that were harshest were also the shortest. Gregory VII, *Registrum* 3.15, in *Das Register Gregors VII*, vol. 1, ed. E. Caspar, MGH Epp selectae (Berlin, 1920), 277 (henceforth Greg. *Reg.*).

and also made proclamations at synods, thus effectively splitting the loyalties of Latin Christians. Gregory mobilized lay lords in his favor: the Tuscan house of Canossa, the Norman princes of southern Italy, and Henry's political rivals in Bavaria and Saxony. Meanwhile, north and south of the Alps, Henry received the support of churchmen who were alarmed by papal ambitions and Gregory's disdain for cherished customs. Even the instituted advisers to the papacy, suburbicarian cardinals of Rome like Beno, had turned against Gregory. Bishops of the empire, in Germany, Lorraine, and northern Italy joined King Henry and elected Archbishop Wibert of Ravenna to replace Gregory as pope. In 1076, his opponents publicly urged Gregory: "Descend! Descend!"[47]

That same year, the pope retaliated at a synod in Rome:[48]

> I deny to King Henry, son of the Emperor Henry, who has risen up with unheard-of pride against your church, the government of the entire kingdom of the Germans, and of Italy, and I absolve all Christians from the bond of any oath that they have taken, or shall take, to him; and I forbid anyone to serve him as king.

Gregory also invalidated any sacraments performed by bishops whom Henry had appointed, and cast doubts on the sacraments of those who continued to pledge friendship and loyalty to the king. Both kinds of sacraments now denied, many Christians were unsure of where their loyalties lay, and of the status of their salvation. To hammer the point home, Gregory organized a meeting in Augsburg, where the princes of Germany would remove Henry from office and put his cousin Rudolf on the throne.

The pope had become an "enemy of peace."[49] In a letter to a bishop identified simply as "A," Henry derided Gregory, refusing even to refer to him by his regnal name:[50]

> Hildebrand . . . a so-called pope (*apostolicus*)—not by the cure of the pastor but by the violence of an invader—incumbent (*presidentem*) of the apostolic seat, and from the seat of catholic peace, dissipating the bond of singular peace.

---

47. Paul, *Vita Greg.* 67, 511; Blumenthal, *Investiture Controversy*, 121.

48. Paul, *Vita Greg.* 76, 516.

49. Robinson, *Authority and Resistance*, 95–100.

50. *Die Briefe Heinrichs IV*, no. 13, ed. Carl Erdmann, MGH Deutsches Mittelalter Kritische Studientexte 1 (Leipzig, 1937), 18–19: "Hildebrandum . . . dictum apostolicum, non pastoris cura, sed invasoris violentia apostolicae sedi presidentem et de sede pacis catholicae pacis unicae vinculum dissipantem."

Hildebrand-Gregory had invaded the apostolic seat by taking it "violently," that is to say, without permission. He had dissipated the bond of peace by breaking the "cornerstone" of concord between *regnum* and *sacerdotium*.[51] His opponents branded the pope a warmonger, schismatic, even a murderer, conflating their impressions of his turbulent policy and his bellicose nature. Gregory's most implacable critic, Benzo of Alba, spoke of him as a wandering, ambitious monk, unknown at the German court and unrecognized by the Romans, who had cheated his way into papal circles and usurped the see.[52] Wido of Osnabrück, Gottschalk of Aachen, Peter Crassus, and Theoderic of Verdun saw Gregory's actions as threats to the peace and unity of the church.[53] Once a supporter, Wido of Ferrara now saw Gregory's calls to sedition as the final act in a series of illegal assaults on *fides*.[54]

In 1078, a year after pope and king had reconciled dramatically at Canossa, Henry resumed his attacks on Gregory, eventually driving the pope from Rome. Gregory responded at the Lenten synod by reinstating his excommunications, while making provisions for papal envoys to rouse the clergy and laity of Germany on his behalf. He also confirmed that priests ordained by excommunicates were priests no longer, and that all who owed loyalty under oath to his excommunicated enemies should now rescind those sacraments; Christians were forbidden to keep faith with their friends and patrons. Gregory modulated these anathemas by absolving servants, pilgrims, and the ignorant from excommunication if they so happened to commune with excommunicates. Nevertheless, Cardinal Beno attacked Gregory for these pronouncements (and even for inconsistency) and focused on the broken oaths.[55] Several Old and New Testament images could have served, but Beno invoked Ezekiel 17 and the fate of Zedekiah to emphasize that Gregory had

51. Sigebert, *EL* 11, 462.

52. Benzo, *Ad Heinricum* 7.2, ed. Hans Seyffert, MGH SSrG 65:582–586, 596, and 603–604. The accusations, while hyperbolic, give a sense of how imperial allies viewed Hildebrand-Gregory's ascent to the papacy.

53. Robinson, *Authority and Resistance*, 95–100.

54. See Robinson, *Authority and Resistance*, 97. See Wido of Ferrara, *De scismate Hildebrandi* 7, ed. R. Wilmans and E. Dümmler, MGH LDL 1:539–540. Wido of Ferrara's systematic layout for and against the actions of Hildebrand-Gregory belies a strict condemnation of the pope. Wido examines the election of a new king in a quasi-legalistic manner, questioning whether Hildebrand's deposition was sanctioned, whether the new king Rudolf should have taken the throne from his former ruler, and the ultimate consequences of these actions for the German people and those around them. *De scismate*, 7, 539–541.

55. Robinson, *Authority and Resistance*, 47, argues that Beno's primary concern was Gregory's inconsistent attitude toward the sacraments.

"ruptured all ordained bonds of faith" and incited rebellion during his tenure as archdeacon and brief rule as pope.[56] Gregory was either a member in Antichrist's body or Antichrist himself, for he had usurped the papacy, and by his policies against the king and his bishops he had made a mockery of the sacraments. He had encouraged lies—the betrayal of oaths—in order to further ecclesiastical independence and sovereignty, an earthly reproduction of his heavenly Jerusalem.[57]

Even moderate controversialists supported imperial accusations against Gregory, consistent as these were with conventional notions of universal peace. In *De unitate ecclesiae conservanda*, an anonymous author—possibly a monk from the imperial abbey of Herzfeld—argued that peace was founded on faith or fidelity (*fides*), expressed in the bond of loyalty to a designated earthly ruler. The papacy's role was to bolster that faith by promoting loyalty to the German king, who in the ordinary course would be crowned Roman emperor. The anonymous author quoted Augustine (*De doctrina christiana* 1.27): "When *fides* totters, the authority of the divine scriptures wavers."[58] Dissolution of earthly bonds refuted both temporal and divine authority.

Aware that Gregorian polemicists had "blasphemed by speaking of God's anointed, King Henry, as a Nebuchadnezzar," the Herzfeld author also turned to Ezekiel 17:[59]

> As I live, said the Lord, since King Zedekiah gave and spurned the oath to the one I have placed above him he will also die through his lie, because he has disdained me.

And added for good measure, the prophet Jeremiah (27.6–8 and 14):

> I will visit with sword, famine, and pestilence the person or kingdom that will not serve Nebuchadnezzar, and whoever has not bent his neck [in submission] to him, I will consume in my hand until they do so.
>
> Do not hear false prophets who say, serve not the king of Babylon, since they lie to you, since I have not sent them . . . do not therefore listen to them, and [instead] serve the king of Babylon.

---

56. Beno, *Contra Hildebrandum* 2.11, 380.

57. Beno, *Contra Hildebrandum* 3.4, 383.

58. *Liber de unitate ecclesiae conservanda* 1.15, ed. W. Schwenkenbecker, MGH LDL 2:208.

59. *De unitate ecclesiae* 2.40, 268.

To his opponents, the pope's insurrection against royal theocracy presented spiritual and political dangers, dangers to peace. Peace meant not just maintenance of the existing political order but also the dispensation of love on earth by means of obedience to that political order. Any contract based on faith or fidelity (*fides* in both cases) was an expression of the Holy Spirit, an embodiment of the love principle, as promised by God's Incarnation. To go back on an oath was not just to lie or to perjure oneself but also to reject God's love manifested in the heart of the faithful.[60] It was to deny oneself the benefit of a sacrament through a failure of the mutual pleasure that bonded human beings. Those who denied themselves this *fides* were in effect denying themselves the opportunity to love.

In the face of complaints and fears from fellow churchmen, Gregory's responses were chilling: "Cursed is the man who keeps back his sword from bloodshed."[61] Typically interpreted (even by Gregory) as a reference to preaching and fatherly admonition, this verse from Jeremiah gains additional resonances in light of the pope's insurrectionist stance. According to his biographer Paul of Bernried, the pope convened the Lenten synod of 1076 with this sermon:[62]

> It is sufficient that until now we have lived in the peace of the church; now indeed let the long arid crop be irrigated once more by the blood of the saints, so that its fruit, enfeebled by a long senescence, may be freshly moistened and return to its pristine appearance.

Sanguinary language appears often in Gregory's pronouncements and letters. But Paul presents an excessively urgent, even apocalyptic address, effectively a call to martyrdom:

> We may now see the devil's war burst forth into an open battlefield, which had so far remained hidden in squalid deceptions. Now therefore it befits the recruits of Christ, bringing educated hands to the conflict, to come against [the devil] so that the faith of Christ, which

60. *De unitate ecclesiae* 1.15, 208.

61. Greg. *Reg.* 1.9, 15; Jer. 48.10; Paul, *Vita Greg.* 29, 486. See also Robert Bartlett, *The Making of Europe: Conquest, Colonization, and Cultural Change, 950–1350* (Princeton, NJ, 1993–94), 260.

62. Paul, *Vita Greg.* 71, 513: "Satis est, quod hucusque in pace viximus ecclesiae; nunc vero diu aridam messem sanctorum iterum sanquine convenit irrigari, ut fructus illius longo senio tabidus, recentiore perfusus, in pristinum redeat decoris adspectum." This sermon appears in Paul's biography fifty years after Gregory's death, and the author may have taken liberties. However, the imagery is consistent with the pope's other pronouncements at the synod and his correspondence.

> through this devil's corruption has been dispersed and abandoned throughout the world, may now be discerned and renewed, while the Lord God fights through us.[63]

Paul wrote this account several decades after the pope's death, and the legend of Gregory may have burnished his descriptions of the synod. Nevertheless, the militancy of Gregorian reform policy had certainly disturbed the pope's contemporaries, especially opponents living near papal strongholds in Lotharingia, Swabia, and Bavaria.[64] Popes had previously sent their secular allies against Muslims in Spain and Palestine and semipagan Saxons in England. But now it appeared they were also turning against other Christians. While still archdeacon, Gregory had supported violent insurrection in northern Italy in the name of reform. In 1100, Pope Paschal II would give papal absolution to Count Robert of Flanders for making war against disobedient bishops at Cambrai and Liège. Disharmony at the spiritual center of Christendom was translated into political and physical conflict everywhere else.

Impressions of Gregory as an enemy of peace were all the more powerful because he agreed that trouble at the papal center would have a grave impact on the periphery. The pope wrote to allies in Carinthia, Swabia, and Bavaria: "We are the head and cause of so much wickedness, we who were elevated for the rulership of people, and called and constituted to be bishops for the winning over of souls. For from their leaders, who from certain instances have received spiritual majesty or worldly dignities, come the good and evil of subjects."[65] An organic relationship (head-body, subject-prelate) determined how peace must be maintained within Christ's dominion. The corollary to this configuration was that lay subjects through insurrection and internecine conflict effectively indicted the "violence" of their clerical leaders. Insurrections of the "Pataria" in and around Milan proved this point, and Gregory did everything to encourage rebellion in the name of reform.

The logic of reformist insurrection was simple: only the sword would make visible a constant but hidden war between the church and diabolical forces.

---

63. Paul, *Vita Greg.* 71, 513: "Videmus pugnam diaboli in apertum prosilire campum, hactenus fuscis squaloribus adopertum. Nunc ideo tirones Christi, doctas manus ad praelia gestantes, convenit obviare, quatenus Christi fides, quae eodem inficiente diabolo, toto paene terrarum orbe dispersa relictaque cernitur, domino Deo per nos pugnante instauretur."

64. Robinson, *Authority and Resistance*, 95–100.

65. Greg. *Reg.* 2.45, 183; Paul, *Vita Greg.* 39, 493–494: "Verum huius tanti mali nos caput et causa sumus, qui ad regendum populum praelati et pro lucrandis animabus episcopi vocati et constituti sumus. Ab eorum namque principatibus, velut a quibusdam initiis, subditorum bona vel mala veniunt, qui aut mundanas dignitates aut magisterum spirituale susceperunt."

Captivity under illicit rulers justified the use of both military and spiritual weapons. When Gregory called unchaste priests "members severed from the body of the Lord," he invoked a spiritual sword that would separate sinners from the ministry of the sacraments.[66] However, when he wrote to lay allies that coercion was permitted against bishops who rebelled against God, Gregory also sanctioned military action.[67]

Gregory pursued reform through the rupture and rebuilding of bonds, the indictment of certain friendships as incompatible with the sacramental bond of the church, and the insistence that one's *fides* could not be apportioned between God and mammon. Thus, he presented Christians with a polarity of sacraments. According to the pope and his followers, when pastors sinned they gave up their bonds (*vinculae*) of peace and community with Christians and instead must be chained in *vinculae excommunicationis*, or "bonds of excommunication."[68] If left unchecked, these "wolves among sheep" would capture the souls of all their subjects. Writing in 1085, a year after Gregory's death, Bishop Bonizo of Sutri reiterated that Christian bishops who performed sacraments without papal sanction were effectively heretics. They were "internal persecutors" to be defeated first by the sword of the gospel but then with all strength and weapons.[69] If no other proofs sufficed to justify military action, reformers could turn to injunctions from the two most respected Latin fathers, Saints Augustine and Gregory the Great. In *City of God*, Augustine had said: "Better is war with the hope of eternal peace than captivity without any thought of liberation"; and in his widely read *Pastoral Care*, Gregory the Great had warned: "Peacemakers are to be admonished that they should not desire mortal peace (*humana pax*) so much that they refuse to rebuke the sinful ways of men."[70] For the sake of true peace, superficial bonds of love, faith, and friendship must be destroyed.

---

66. *Ep. vag.* 9 (Jaffé 4970); Paul, *Vita Greg.* 37, 491. See also *Ep. vag.* 8 (Jaffé 4933); Paul, *Vita Greg.* 36, 490.

67. *Ep. vag.* 10 (Jaffé 4971); Paul, *Vita Greg.* 38, 492–493: "coactus ad viam iustitiae addiscat redire." I translate *coactus* as "coercion," following Robinson, *Papal Reform*, 287. See the comparative lack of stress on coercion (translated as "constraint") in H. E. J. Cowdrey, ed., *The "Epistolae vagantes" of Pope Gregory VII* (Oxford, 1972), 25.

68. *Ep. vag.* 14 (Jaffé 4999); Paul, *Vita Greg.* 78, 521.

69. Bonizo of Sutri, *Liber ad amicum* 1, ed. Ernst Dümmler, MGH LDL 1:572.

70. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 21.15, ed. Emanuel Hoffman, CSEL 40/2: 546; Gregory the Great, *Regulae pastoralis liber* 3.22, PL 77:90D: "Unde et admonendi sunt pacati, ne dum nimis humanam pacem desiderant, pravos hominum mores nequaquam redarguant."

The Gregorian reform's well-known attention to sacramental integrity cannot be understood without accepting that the reformers were targeting not only unlawful celebrants and tainted ceremonies but *all* sociopolitical bonds that could be a threat to ecclesial liberty. As justification for sedition, Gregorian polemicists distinguished between oaths of loyalty that must be kept (good sacraments) and those that had to be broken (wicked sacraments). The Christian mode of living in genuine peace could therefore only be insurrectionist, which meant the rupture of any and all sacraments that bound human beings in political communities that denigrated the ideal of church government.

Gregory VII's experiments with peace may have had drastically different outcomes from those of his predecessors, yet their goals and inspiration remained very similar. Defense and redefinition of peace appear to have been imperatives under Leo IX and under Alexander II, two popes in whose court Hildebrand rose to prominence. But several factors conspired to produce those ferocious Lenten synods of the late 1070s, as well as the spectacularly unsuccessful peace of Canossa and the urban insurrectionist movements that I describe in the next two chapters. Henry IV was no Henry III; he was young, eager to break from a regency government, anxious to recover friendships that had dwindled in the years after his father's death, and counseled by men who had resented the domineering archdeacon Hildebrand over several years. At the same time, the acceleration of reformist conflict under Gregory owes much to his espousal of certain polarizing anxieties about captivity, sacramental purity and the incursion of empire into the church. As I will show in the following chapter, these fears of enervating peace and false sacraments had once been given a voice by the third-century Carthaginian bishop and martyr Cyprian. That they emerged again in the words of an eleventh-century pope speaks as much to their own power as to the context of persecution in which Gregory imagined himself.

Chapter 3

False Sacraments

Violence, Captivity, and Insurrection

During Lent in 1074, the assistants of the bishop of Milan prepared a chrism, as they did every year in preparation for the public baptism of infants and catachumens at Easter. This year, however, on the appointed day, a vavasor named Erlembald pushed himself through the waiting crowds, snatched the chrism, and before everyone's eyes spilled it and then stamped on it. According to the chronicle of Arnulf of Milan, which is hostile to Erlembald and his followers, the vavasor then produced a replacement, "though made by whom no one knows, nor from where it came."[1] Erlembald proceeded to perform his own baptisms, ignoring scriptural injunctions that one should not "transgress boundaries laid by the fathers."[2]

The leader of a radical reform movement, Erlembald intended his desecration and replacement of the chrism as a public act, not a rejection of Milan's peculiar rituals so much as its customs and clergy. The content of the Easter ceremony was individual to Milan, the city having retained a liturgy that its legendary bishop, Ambrose, had adapted from Byzantine ceremonial

1. Arnulf, *Liber gestorum recentium* 4.6, ed. Claudia Zey, MGH SSrGs 67:210.

2. Prov. 22.28. Arnulf, *Liber gestorum* 4.6, 210.

around 380. In the interests of peace and unity in the church, and out of respect for Saint Ambrose, Pope Gregory I had allowed Milan its unique traditions and ceremonies, even as he rewrote the Roman rite at the end of the sixth century.[3] By the 1060s, however, Milan's clergy and its cherished traditions had come under attack, internally from Erlembald's group of lay reformers, known as the Pataria, and externally by Alexander II and Gregory VII, pontiffs who actively encouraged the Paterene revolt.[4]

During the uprising of the Milanese Pataria, conflict on the peripheries of Rome's authority validated and shaped the radical insurrectionist language of papal courtiers, who had made the integrity of all sacraments the moral core of resistance to imperial demands. It was a concern that they shared with allies and opponents alike, because sacraments guarded the true church and provided the proving ground for rightful ecclesial leadership. Considered bonds more than ceremonies, the sacraments also provided a barometer of social disruption and moral degeneration. All manner of religious and social ties either aspired to become or else simply mimicked the quintessential bond of Christian sacrament. Both in churches that offered divine grace and in their counterfeits, prelates performed sacraments, and worshippers came together. However, as papal reformers asserted, only in one church—their church—were these members incorporated in Christ's body through an authentic and life-saving bond of peace (*vinculum pacis*).[5]

The Pataria spoke to long-standing anxieties about misappropriated sacraments. They were not only a theological concern but also the basis of an alternative, illicit church ruled by antibishops—that is, the basis of social alienation, moral dissolution, and ultimate perdition. As early as 250, in his treatise *De lapsis* (On the Lapsed), Cyprian of Carthage had argued that an alternate sacrament conveyed not peace but war.[6] Cyprian called these empty,

3. See Bonizo, *Liber ad amicum* 6, ed. E. Dümmler, MGH LDL 1:591.

4. For the extent of papal instigation of Milan's civil disturbances from the 1060s to 1075, see H. E. J. Cowdrey, "The Papacy, the Patarenes, and the Church of Milan," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 18, ser. 5 (1968): 25–48. See also Cinzio Violante, *La Pataria Milanese e la riforma ecclesiastica*, vol. 1 (Rome, 1955), for the movement as it paralleled the early years of papal reform until the first Patarene delegation to Rome in 1057.

5. Alger of Liège, *De sacramentis corporis et sanguinis Dominici*, PL 180:749C–750D, for "vinculum pacis."

6. Cyprian, *De lapsis* 16, ed. M. Bévenot, CCSL 3:229–230: "Pacem putant esse quam quidam verbis fallacibus vendidant: non est *pax* illa sed bellum." (They think it to be peace that they sell with lying words: that is not peace but war.)

mimic sacraments *pax falsa*, "false peace." The eleventh-century Patarene reformers held the Milanese sacraments to be similarly tainted, snares set by priests who kept concubines despite new canonical injunctions of clerical celibacy.[7]

Between 1056 and 1075, in defiance of Milan's ruling archbishop, the Pataria regularly prevented noncelibate priests from conveying sacramental bonds and physically barred recalcitrant priests from performing communion, even driving them from the altar with blows. But for Arnulf, a descendant and partisan of Milan's bishops, physical harm paled in comparison to the violence of the Easter desecration. With the seasonal chrism spoiled, many lost the joy of divine grace. Offering his own sacrament, the doer of the wicked deed embroiled the multitude in his error, partly with bribes but also because the populace was simple, and unable to distinguish between true and false. Unfortunately simplicity was not the same as blamelessness. Erlembald had initiated a "consortium" that attracted the wicked but from which the loving and guiltless would keep aloof: in effect, he had reversed the sacrament and created a perverse and diabolical community.[8] For supporters and opponents of insurrection, defense of sacramental integrity provided the motive force; the debasement of sacraments whether by war or deception constituted the extreme of violence.

This chapter examines a discourse of sedition and political resistance at the intersection of sacramental concerns and desires for true peace, a discourse that marks the transformation of papal reform between the tenures of Leo IX and Gregory VII. Vehicles for anxiety about excessive worldliness, inverted sacraments resurfaced in eleventh-century Rome just as the popes began to accrue monarchical authority.[9] Energetic supporters of the Pataria, papal reformers had long denounced the sacraments of tainted clergymen as worthless. By 1074, they had determined that such sacraments were even worse than useless because they carried the danger of seduction: ignorant congregants might believe they had received communion, when in fact they had become trapped in a bond of excommunication. By the time of Erlembald's transgression, the reformers had also turned their attention to another

7. Bonizo, *Liber ad amicum* 6, 591–592.

8. Arnulf, *Liber gestorum* 4.6, 210–211.

9. Uta-Renate Blumenthal, *The Investiture Controversy: Church and Monarchy from the Ninth to the Twelfth Century* (Philadelphia, 1982), 75–76, discusses disputations on sacramental purity and efficacy between Peter Damian and Humbert of Silva Candida in the years that followed Leo IX's institution of a *curia* or court in Rome.

type of sacrament, the oaths that laypersons exchanged with one another, personal and political bonds no less freighted with divine grace and clerical sanction. When subjects formed such bonds with wicked rulers, they effectively made a pact with mammon against God, trapping themselves and their friends in a concord of hidden but extreme violence. Reformers like Pope Gregory cut their teeth on civic insurrection in northern Italy as a prelude to confrontation with the empire over sacramental liberty.

Liberation from the captivity of false sacraments called for any and all measures, including insurrection and killing. Sacramental concerns had fueled the reform struggle from its beginnings, but by the 1070s and 1080s the sacraments constituted the justification—indeed the pattern—for revelation and destruction of hidden violence and diabolical conspiracy. By instigating the rejection of oaths in cities and even in monasteries, reform popes made the church's captivity to false sacraments manifest, disrupting a tranquil system to open it up to the reception of an authentic peace.

It was no coincidence then that Pope Gregory VII, who called on Christians to rebel against their bishops and emperor, also gave his full support to the Pataria. Far from decrying the trampling of chrism as blasphemy, Gregory encouraged Paterene insurrection. In 1066, when he was still the archdeacon Hildebrand, Gregory had prevailed on his pontiff to confer on Erlembald the banner (*vexillum*) of Saint Peter. This was the same banner—possibly fashioned by Gregory himself—that Ebles de Roucy carried to the Reconquista in Spain, and William of Normandy to the invasion of Saxon England, during the papacy of Gregory's predecessor Alexander II.[10] The banner conferred an implicit (and in the case of Ebles, explicit) absolution for killing for the sake of Saint Peter's domain. Even after the Milanese people overthrew the Pataria and slew and mutilated its leaders, Gregory continued to espouse the Patarene cause, interpreting the civil war and subsequent injuries as an embodiment of the church's spiritual captivity and struggle for liberation.

The fall of the Pataria in 1075 provided a backdrop for the Investiture Controversy, a conflict over ecclesiastical jurisdiction between papacy and empire that sundered the loyalties of Latin Christians, separated clerical and secular rulership, and seeded future distinctions of church and state. Strains

10. For an extensive discussion of the papal banner as a "feudal" device, including a tentative surmise that Hildebrand invented it, see Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, trans. Marshall Baldwin and Walter Goffart (Princeton, NJ, 1977; Ger. orig., Stuttgart, 1935; repr., 2010), 182–200. Erdmann also notes that once he was pope Hildebrand-Gregory is recorded as conferring the banner only once, on Robert Guiscard (194).

had appeared decades earlier when Popes Leo IX and Nicholas II accrued the authority they believed necessary for the reform of the church, carefully but only barely skirting the question of Christian sovereignty. But in 1075, when Gregory VII and King Henry IV of Germany fought over the authority to appoint an archbishop to the vacant see of Milan, it became clear that Christians must make a mortal choice between the now-competing demands (political as well as spiritual) of royal and priestly theocracy.[11] Henry and several bishops demanded that Gregory renounce the papacy, while the pope excommunicated the German king, denied him the loyalty of his subjects, and mobilized the German princes to choose a replacement. Between 1075 and 1110, the conflict consumed generations—six popes and two emperors—and its aftershocks haunted papal-imperial relationships throughout the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. By the end of the twelfth century, largely through such insurrectionist methods, popes had reimagined the church as a kingdom and arrogated to themselves the power to judge and depose emperors. It is tempting to treat the Pataria as an anecdotal accompaniment to this much-broader conflict, or as a reverberation of reformist ideology outside of Rome. But Gregory's theology of insurrection crystallized in the political crucible of the Pataria a decade before it emerged as anti-imperial polemic. Inspired by papal reformist aspirations, civil war on the peripheries of papal authority imbued these aspirations with a new direction and legitimacy.

Gregory's espousal of radical resistance cannot be understood without considering another hero of the struggle for sacramental purity, Saint Cyprian of Carthage. It is Cyprian's ideas and fears that Gregory expresses in his vision of a newly refreshed church of martyrs, of an encampment guarded by true sacraments against a debilitating imperial peace. Cyprian lived, wrote, and died in a Christian community persecuted by empire, and it is signficant that Gregory VII and his successors espoused his struggle as their own. The papal reform, and the Investiture Controversy that lies at the heart of it, cannot be understood without examining the reform's core concerns for protection of the sacraments. The patristic genealogy of these concerns helps explain why reform popes were ready to embrace warfare in a struggle against unacceptable peace.

---

11. This is the interpretation of the Investiture Controversy in Gerd Tellenbach, *Church, State, and Society at the Time of the Investiture Contest*, trans. R. F. Bennett (Oxford, 1940).

Resistance to False Peace: Protection of the Sacraments

Gregory VII tried to reform the church into a standing army, a camp of would-be martyrs in training who would raise arms when summoned to battle, while remaining disciplined under the authority of a legitimate bishop. Combat and discipline thus complemented one another in the training of the Christian soldier. The pope declared that the church had had enough of the prevailing state of peace, and demanded that the renewed *ecclesia* spring from new drops of blood. The sheer militancy of this call reminds the reader of Tertullian ("blood of Christians is seed"), but whereas that writer's rigorism and zeal veered toward an earthly anarchy, Gregory set great store by ecclesiastical institutions and hierarchies. He was in this regard the descendant of a more subtle experimenter with peace: the Carthaginian bishop Cyprian.

Hero of the Donatist schismatics for his espousal of second baptism, Cyprian is also the paradigm for Catholics for his insistence on the monopolistic authority of bishops and the integrity of a single sacrament. His legacy to the Gregorian reform is both indisputable and controversial, largely on account of his acknowledgment (widely shared among his African contemporaries) of the validity of rebaptism. As Gerhart Ladner has noted, rigorist radicals from the Donatists to Humbert of Silva Candida adopted the Cyprianist conviction that a priest's moral state determined his right to exercise office. Nicholas Häring, who credits the reform to a revival of Cyprianist ideas, derides Cyprian as the basis for "dangerous" sacramental problems countered by moderates (and imperialists) like Bernold of Constance and Alger of Liège.[12] But Cyprian gave the Gregorians more than a wonky sacramentology. He provided a model of concerns that combined resistance to empire, protection of the church sacraments, and promotion of a monolithic ecclesiastical hierarchy.

Medieval church reform drew inspiration from Cyprian's response to the counterpoint of persecution and internal fracture in the North African church. In between frontal assaults, brief periods of peace proved as detrimental to Christian harmony as did imperial aggression. Between 200 and 400, imperial Rome had intruded sharply into the Christian community, first

12. Gerhart Ladner, *The Idea of Reform: Its Impact on Christian Thought and Action in the Age of the Fathers* (New York, 1967; orig. 1959), 306–308; Nicholas M. Haring, "A Study in the Sacramentology of Alger of Liége," *Mediaeval Studies* 20 (1958): 45. (Note: I have retained the use of an archaic spelling of Liège as well as the anglicized version of Häring's name as it appears in this journal; he is more commonly known and published under the German spelling.)

with systematic persecutions and then through the attempts of Constantine and his successors to nurture the religion. Gifts of Rome both, these extremes of peace and conflict carried with them all the dangers of the *saeculum*: ill influence, seduction, and distorted judgment. Was it possible for Christians to enjoy a mutual peace among themselves while simultaneously enjoying the peace of this world? The world and the Roman state being coextensive, to what extent were Christians allowed to desire or pursue peace on earth? These were questions for a church that was in the process of institutionalizing while simultaneously agonizing over whether its evolution smacked too strongly of a sociopolitical order that it had always sought to reject.

The formation of identity in a crucible of violence is a complex and conflicted process. Since imperial persecution rarely took a consistent form, North African Christians experienced vastly different contexts in which to consider the world, its persecution and its peace. Tertullian's Carthage of the early third century had only pockets of Christians; and they were not harassed on a systematic scale, as would happen after 250.[13] Nonetheless, the true church for Tertullian was a persecuted body defined by martyrdom. Suffering without retaliation (*patientia*) in the face of the world's violence served not only to mark God's own but also to attract others to the faith, and ultimately to increase God's anger against the unjust.

Of course, Christian identity would be a meager thing to rely only on the capricious malice of Roman rulers.[14] Given the demands and seductions of the material world, persecution was everywhere. The gladiatorial spectacles only summed up a constant predicament for Christians. Indeed, the games brought together in one space the abuse of pagan neighbors and the vainglory of worldly excess—but one did not have to stand in

13. The long-standing master narrative of Christian persecutions dates the first, systematic imperial onslaught to the decrees of Septimius Severus in 201. Maureen Tilley, *The Bible in Christian North Africa: The Donatist World* (Minneapolis, 1996), 42, maintains that the Severan persecutions were the "first, organized empire-wide persecution." See also W. H. C. Frend, *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church: A Study of a Conflict from the Maccabees to Donatus* (New York, 1967), 240. William Tabbernee's review, *Church History* 67, no. 4 (Dec. 1998): 750, challenges Tilley's acceptance of the traditional narrative. The most emphatic revision is Timothy D. Barnes, *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study* (Oxford, 1971), 143–158, who argues that previous persecutions were fragmentary and localized.

14. Tertullian's *Apologeticum*, which was addressed to the Roman magistrates of North Africa, is both a plea to their reason and an expression of scorn and defiance toward the pagan world around him. *Tertullian, Apologeticum*, ed. E. Dekkers, CCSL 1. See Geoffrey Dunn, *Tertullian* (London, 2004), 8, on Tertullian's discretion in apologetic works. Dunn's source is R. F. Evans, "On the Problem of Church and Empire," *Studia patristica* 14 (1976): 21–22.

the arena to suffer; mere participation would suffice.[15] Since Satan and his minions had completely filled the world, any and all social and cultural institutions carried the threat of corruption.[16] Without seeking war against pagans, Christians were compelled to reject the pagan world as a "camp of darkness" aligned against the church's "camp of light."[17] Worldly violence could range from wearing dyed clothing and sculpting to serving the state militarily or through oaths.[18]

Like his beloved martyrs, Tertullian did not distinguish between the Roman world and the Roman state. So the military assaults of Rome were not ruptures but continuities in the embattled sojourn of Christians in the world. They were educational, a sample of the diabolical forces that would always be ranged against the church before the end of time. Fittingly, the games provided the context for confession and renunciation at their most explicit: martyrdom. Impressed by the blood of martyrs, citizens were becoming catechumens, earthly indications that martyrdom was the great engine of the Lord's anger, enlarging the church and driving the enemy closer to its ultimate destruction.[19]

A camp of light engaged in unceasing battle with the world, the church nevertheless appropriated an essentially Roman mode of military discipline: the *sacramentum*. *Sacramenta* conveyed both the insignia of Christian

15. In Tertullian's testimony, Christians are hated more in name than anything else: a specter, an outlawed people, against whom the magistrates are only gradually being pushed to act. Their pagan neighbors gossip about regular sacrifices at which the "Chrestians" eat babies and drink their blood, a distortion presumably of the Christian Supper. *Apologeticum* 3.5–6, 92 and 7.1, 98.

16. Tertullian, *De spectaculis* 8.1–11, ed. E. Dekkers, CCSL 1:235.

17. Tertullian, *De idololatria* 19.2, ed. A. Reifferscheid and G. Wissowa, CCSL 2:1120: "Non convenit sacramento divino et humano, signo Christi et signo diaboli, castris lucis et castris tenebrarum." Tertullian uses this militaristic image repeatedly in works like *De corona* (The Wreath), where he aligns participation in the Roman state with idolatry, defined narrowly as the donning of pagan insignia.

18. Peter Brown, *Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (New York, 1988), 76–77, gives an inverted version of the same argument: martyrdom remained elusive in Tertullian's Carthage, where high-born Christian philosophers rarely provoked Roman authorities to action. Instead, the body became the locus of aspiration; the martyr's combat was presaged and partially fulfilled through continence and modesty (*castitas* and *pudicitia*).

19. The early, sporadic North African assaults gave Christians compelling episodes of martyrdom, such as the Passion diary of Perpetua and the account of her companions, Felicitas and Saturus, in the arena. On the eve of their execution, confessors would warn their tormentors of the great vengeance to come, a vengeance that authors like Lactantius and Eusebius would live to see fulfilled. Tertullian played a part in the preservation and circulation of these stories, and it is likely that he saw in these persecutions the beginning of the end of days. On the question of whether Tertullian edited the *Passio Perpetuae*, see Johannes Quasten, *Patrology* (Utrecht, 1950), 1:181–182; and Barnes, *Tertullian*, 79–80.

membership and the oath made to Christ.[20] Through renunciation of the world—and especially of the games—Christians took up weapons, sealed themselves, and swore allegiance against the enemy.[21] By this deliberate appropriation of Roman military terminology, Tertullian posited dueling sacraments, Christian seals of faith against insignia of the devil's army.

In his *Prescription against Heretics* Tertullian explores oaths made to Satan:[22]

> [The devil] apes the essence of the divine sacraments by the mysteries of his idols. He also anoints some, his believers and faithful; he promises the expiation of faults by [his] baptism. So also am I reminded of Mithras, who signs this way the foreheads of his soldiers and also celebrates the oblation of the bread and induces an image of resurrection and confers a crown under a sword.

The Roman army with its banners, crowns, and baptisms of blood employed the same measures of discipline and reward that Tertullian desired for the Christian community—but Mithraism was pervasive here. Like the games, the military provided a classic inversion because it came so close to Christian combat. Service in the Roman army often culminated in a wreath that soldiers received for exceptional performance. To Tertullian this became "mimicry of martyrdom," and a mockery therefore of the true, Christian sacraments. The world or Roman state and the church were two almost identical camps, exactly opposite in the authenticity of their peace yet separated only by the purity and integrity of the Christian *sacramenta*.

In this combative outlook, Christ's gift of peace formed a boundary rather than a bridge between the church and a Roman world of material

---

20. Both insignia and oath are images taken from the Roman military, as Adolf Harnack has pointed out. Adolf Harnack, *Militia Christi: The Christian Religion and the Military in the First Three Centuries*, trans. David M. Gracie (Philadelphia, 1981; Ger. orig. 1905; repr., 1963), 53–54. If he did not coin the term *sacramenta* for the Christian rituals of entry and retention, Tertullian at the very least popularized it.

21. *De spec.* 24.1–4, 248. Fittingly, the games provided the context for confession at its most explicit: martyrdom. On his disgust at the games, and rejection of them as a Christian sacrament, also see *De spec.* chaps. 4, 8, 15, 16, and 24 (pp. 227–253) and *Apologeticum* 8.4, 149–150; Barnes, *Tertullian*, 62. The *Acts of the Scillitan Martyrs*, a foundational text for African Christians, is also a rejection of the world itself as alien and hostile.

22. Tertullian, *Liber de prescriptione haereticorum* 40.2–4, ed. R. F. Refoulé, CCSL 1:220: "[diabolus] ipsas quoque res sacramentorum divinorum idolorum mysteriis aemulatur. Tingit et ipse quosdam utique credentes et fideles suos; expositionem dilectorum de lavacro repromittit, et si adhuc memini Mithrae signat illic in frontibus milites suos, celebrat et panis oblationem et imaginem resurrectionis inducit, et sub gladio redimit coronam." Harnack, *Militia Christi*, 59, provides a partial translation and important discussion.

comforts and pagan attachments. Internally at peace, Christians could not simultaneously have peace with outside society, certainly not with the Roman state.[23] Entry and retention within the church hinged on the grant or withdrawal of *pax et communio*, the right of cultic participation. Baptism forgave the sins that had come before, and elevated the convert to a higher threshold of forgiveness, but it also imposed greater responsibilities on sinners; the Holy Spirit was delicate, easily offended.[24] Once baptized, relapsed sinners must perform public confession and extreme penance, *exomologesis*, in order to recover lost peace and communion.[25] They could take the Eucharist only when peace had been restored to them.[26] In his later, "Montanist" writing, Tertullian decried even Christian institutions as tainted by love of the world, and his views hardened regarding the relationship between peace, penance, and the Eucharist. For those baptized, it was possible to fall into grave sins from which no ecclesiastical instruments could excuse them; on earth they had lost the peace of the church, and, therefore, the Eucharist.[27] These *lapsi* could regain peace only by joining the community of martyrs—that is, through a "second baptism," not by water but by their own blood.[28]

In this little preserve of radical peacemaking it is possible to see elements of a breakaway Donatist church that would be condemned by its Catholic opponents as exclusionary and obsessed with misguided yearnings for martyrdom. Such notions of peace were already losing credence in the African church during Tertullian's own lifetime, but a complete articulation of a more acceptable peace appeared only during Cyprian's tenure as bishop of Carthage. As the community gained prominence by the middle of the third century, Christian peace could no longer remain distinct from the overtures of pagan neighbors. Both imperial antagonism and support complicated the

23. W. H. C. Frend, *The Donatist Church: A Movement of Protest in Roman North Africa* (Oxford, 1952), 106–107; Tertullian, *Apologeticum* 38.1–3, 149, and on all aspects of Roman society as idolatry, *De idololatria* 8.1, 1105–9.8, 1109.

24. Tertullian, *De spec.* 15.1, 240–16.7, 242.

25. William Swann, "The Relationship between Penance, Reconciliation with the Church, and Admission to the Eucharist in the Letters and the *De Lapsis* of Cyprian of Carthage" (PhD diss., Catholic University of America, 1980), 37–42.

26. Ibid., 35.

27. Ibid., 54–56.

28. Barnes, *Tertullian*, 167 and 174; Swann, "Penance," 59; Tertullian, *De baptismo* 16.1–3, ed. J. G. Ph. Borleffs, CCSL 1:290–291; and Tertullian, *Scorpiace* 6.10, ed. A. Reifferscheid and G. Wissowa, CCSL 2:1080; but note that Barnes places *Scorpiace* in 203–204, his "pre-Montanist" period.

politics of Christian community, raising new questions about the overlap between the peace of the church and the peace of the world.

Between 249 and 258, the emperors Decius, Gallus, and Valerius embarked on systematic and exceptionally severe assaults on Christian communities. It now seemed futile to insist on an undifferentiated combat with the world. Relative to the intense persecutions, periods of respite must be considered peace, but in such a peace, strains within the church found their full expression. In times of assault, many had fled the church, while others faced imprisonment and even martyrdom. Once peace was restored, however, apostates demanded reentry, while previously imprisoned confessors insisted that only they possessed the authority to reconcile the lapsed faithful.

Unlike Tertullian, Cyprian experienced imperial persecution not as the subversive demands of a pagan culture but as the frontal assault of rulers committed to the exposure and eradication of Christians. Following a zenith under the Antonine emperors, imperial dignity increasingly relied on enhancements of the emperor's divinity.[29] Christianity with its aspirations to a universal, eternal kingdom had always had the potential to subvert Roman, imperial claims. Now the new imperial ideology made Christian monotheism treasonous. Until the third century, Christians in North Africa had not been numerous enough to prompt a systematic purge, but the antagonism of pagan neighbors had made martyrdom the community paradigm; early martyrologies expressed claims of leadership as well as general defiance of the world.[30] The outlines of martyrdom hardened after 249, when Quintus Triannus Decius defeated his former master, Philip the Arab, to become sole ruler of the empire. Anxious to strengthen his own claims as well as the claims of the imperial office, Decius issued decrees for the invigoration of emperor worship. Proclamations spread, demanding that Christian bishops and presbyters

29. In Numidia and Mauretania, the African-born Septimius Severus built statues of himself in the temples of Saturn, anthropomorphizing (and Romanizing) the region's dreaded, "old man" god. Frend, *Donatist Church*, 104–106. Frend has suggested that Numidians disgusted with the Romanizing of Saturn turned to Christianity en masse.

30. Stories of North African martyrdom written between 200 and 249 show a community working to accommodate a mixture of citizenry, slaves, and peasants. The Passion diaries of Perpetua and Saturus (ca. 203) testify to the way in which a common faith—and a shared crown—breaks down status barriers. *Passio Sanctarum Perpetuae et Felicitatis* 15, in *Acts of the Christian Martyrs*, ed. and trans. Herbert Musurillo (Oxford, 1972), 122. Maureen Tilley argues that, by contrast, two works dated to 259, the *Passio Mariani et Iacobi* and the *Passio Montani et Lucii*, show a community torn by internal quarrels and anxious about choosing the correct leaders. Tilley, *Donatist World*, 45–47.

turn over their scriptures. Further proclamations insisted that the long-standing practice of ritual sacrifice to the emperor—an act of idolatry to Christians—be thoroughly enforced. Citizens were forced to produce certificates (*libelli*) confirming that they had performed the ritual of *nuncupatio votorum*, a supervised submission to imperial deity.[31] Christians died resisting, or simply exiled themselves; they also apostatized in unprecedented numbers.

In the face of extreme and immediate oppression, the general struggle with the world receded. When such a world offered temporary peace, it must be distinguished from the combat that had preceded it. The problem was how to retain the Spirit when moving from a state of war against the world to one of mutual peace. Bishop Cyprian initially advised Christians to cooperate with the authorities as much as conscience allowed; ultimately, one might go into hiding until the worst was over.[32] Perhaps on account of this discretion, the bishop faced several threats to his authority after Decius's death in 251. Cyprian responded by insisting that in novel political circumstances, persecution had taken a new form: capitalizing on their prowess during times of conflict, pseudoapostles were now offering mirror churches, with mirror sacraments, to threaten the rightful stewardship of moderate bishops like himself.

The emperor's death in 251, and the restoration of relative toleration in the empire, prompted Cyprian to emerge from exile and speak of peace restored to the church, implying that outside of imperial assault, the church need not be at constant war with the world.[33] He was willing to accept certain modes of relative peace but at the same time was committed to distinguishing acceptable forms from those that were abhorrent. Cyprian got an opportunity during a controversy over whether to grant peace to the lapsed, those who apostatized during the persecutions. These *lapsi*, Cyprian argued, were not defeated by Roman violence; they had cast off their faith

31. Some eluded prosecution by producing fake certificates of sacrifice. On the *nuncupatio votorum* as idolatry, see Swann, "Penance," 122.

32. This was not cowardice but rather flexibility in the face of changing circumstances. See Barnes, *Tertullian*, 168, on a similar approach taken by Clement of Alexandria ca. 203. Cyprian himself retired from office during the Decian persecutions of 250–251 in the interests of public order but refused to go into hiding when hostilities resumed in 257; he was beheaded in 258. *Acta proconsularia sancti Cypriani* 4, in *Acts of the Christian Martyrs*, 173; and Peter Hinchliff, *Cyprian of Carthage and the Unity of the Christian Church* (London, 1974), 128.

33. *De lapsis* 1, 221: "Pax ecce, dilectissimi fratres, ecclesiae reddita est."

even before persecution began.[34] At the same time a zealous few had defied the authorities by openly confessing and even invading pagan ceremonies. Imprisoned "confessors" gained such standing in the community that many arrogated to them the power to restore penitent apostates in the peace of the church.[35] Apostates sought reentry based on letters of forgiveness from imprisoned confessors, called *libelli pacis* because their authors claimed the power to give peace to their traitors and tormentors. Cyprian opposed the notion that confessors could grant such peace; it was not the place of servants of God to pardon other servants. Only bishops had the power to reconcile penitent apostates through ceremonial retransmission of the Holy Spirit, but even they could not guarantee salvation.[36]

Cyprian insisted on penance, but in keeping with North African custom, he also held that the lapsed must be baptized anew in order to have access to the *pax et communio* of the religious body.[37] The Donatists later located their separatist church around this issue, calling Cyprian their founder; the bishop of Carthage would have recoiled from their esteem since rebaptism did

34. Cyprian's somewhat invidious position haunts him in this text. Throughout he argues that those—like himself—who went into exile also experienced persecution, that the unity and universality of the church ensures that all Christians—even those in hiding—feel the physical pains meted out to the front ranks of martyrs. In addition, many of those who renounced their faith must be forgiven if they did so under duress. The examples of two martyrs, Castus and Aemilius, who died for the church after initially apostatizing, suggests to Cyprian that the Lord still crowns those who flee in the face of physical oppression. Cyprian's attitude remains more rigorist than that of prelates like Peter of Alexandria in the aftermath of the Diocletian persecution. Barnes, *Tertullian*, 168–171, writes that in the interests of unity and in order to restore the dignity of the survivors, many of whom had fled or apostatized perforce, Peter gave flight a somewhat higher standing than even martyrdom.

35. The influence of these confessors had grown in parallel with the institutional solidification of the church in North Africa. In the *Passio Perpetuae*, the young Roman matron had a dream just before martyrdom in which she rescued her long-dead brother from an eternity of torment in the afterlife. Timothy Barnes suggests that this is an argument for the martyr's ability to reconcile lost souls, a pattern common to Montanist writings. Barnes, *Tertullian*, 78. It becomes explicit in a vision vouchsafed to Perpetua's companion Saturus, in which he and Perpetua visit God and upon leaving meet their bishop Optatus, who begs to be reconciled. *Passio Perp.* 13.120–122. A prescient Tertullian, his esteem for martyrs notwithstanding, had expressed alarm at this charismatic trend—not out of respect for the bishops but because it was blasphemy to arrogate to human beings the divine power of ultimate reconciliation. See Barnes, *Tertullian*, 183–184, on his scorn for the "cult of martyrs [which] increased as readiness for martyrdom declined." See also *De pudicitia*, ed. E. Dekkers, CCSL 2:22.1328.

36. Cyprian, *Epistulae* 54.3, ed. W. Hartel, CSEL 3.2:623 (henceforth *Ep.*).

37. Cyprian's moderate position between the rigorists and the inclusionists was inflected by his understanding that the sacrament of baptism was effective only if it conveyed the Holy Spirit, and the taint of treachery would prevent spiritual transmission. For this reason, apostates or those who had been baptized by lapsed bishops must now be baptized once more. J. P. Keleher, *Saint Augustine's Notion of Schism in the Donatist Controversy* (Mundelein, IL, 1961), 17.

not rank highly among his concerns.[38] What mattered was whether bishops should restore the peace of the church to those who had exchanged it for peace with the pagan empire.

The sacraments controlled peace: baptism, the initial, sacramental conferral of the church's *pax et communio*, and penance, a new conferral of *pax*. With the boundaries of the church under such strain, Cyprian revised the sacraments in tandem with his vision of peace: unity and purity under a single church hierarchy. The power to mediate among Christians and between humanity and God must rest on earth with bishops, whose cultic responsibilities gave them a monopoly on peacemaking. The *libelli pacis* of imprisoned confessors therefore posed a threat to the bishop's divinely conferred role as mediator between humanity and God. Under Cyprian's leadership, the Council of Carthage decreed that *libellicati*, those who had pretended to apostatize by presenting false certificates of sacrifice, were to be readmitted to the church following penance. *Sacrificati*, those who had actually sacrificed to the emperor, must also perform penance but would be reconciled only on their deathbed.[39] When it seemed that persecutions might resume in 253, Cyprian further adjusted the policy by granting expedient reconciliation to the *sacrificati*.[40] He made these compromises to forestall the extreme potential for a diabolical anti-church. Returning apostates must have the chance to find true peace within the church; otherwise, they would be tempted to make a false peace outside it.

For Cyprian, false conferrals of peace seduced Christians into idolatry; they would lapse by "[putting their] hope in man," by putting man above God, by trading Christ for mammon.[41] He called it "another persecution, another temptation by which the keen enemy waylays the lapsed, who even now are assaulted by a secret devastation."[42] Thanks to this hidden violence, this infection, a time of peace had become more dangerous than even the imperial persecutions.[43] For internal persecutions that took place in times of tranquility, Christians must undergo a different form of scourging, the chastisement of their bishops. In the act of reconciliation, there must be

38. In fact, the early church fathers had often debated rebaptism. Keleher, *Notion of Schism*, 15–18.

39. Swann, "Penance," 367.

40. Cyprian, *Ep.* 57.2, 651–652. Cyprian's letter to Antonianus (*Ep.* 55) lays out the reasons behind this change.

41. *De lapsis* 17, 230.

42. *De lapsis* 16, 230: "Persecutio est haec alia et alia temptatio, per quam subtilis inimicus inpugnandis adhuc lapsis occulta populatione grassatur."

43. Cyprian, *Ep.* 59.18, 688: "Armant nos haeretici dum nos putant sua comminatione terreri, nec in faciem nos deiciunt, sed magis erigunt et accedunt, *dum ipsam pacem persecutione peirorem fratribus faciunt*" (emphasis added).

pain, as the prelate-physician cut out the infected flesh despite the cries of the patient.[44] In peace, only bitterness and shame would turn the vanquished back into soldiers.[45] The antichurch that had begun to spring up in Rome and North Africa was the final and greatest trial of the persecutions because instead of simply confronting Christians with violence, it offered a separate communion: peace where there was none.[46]

In a world where bishops could not automatically claim authority over their fellow Christians, Cyprian gave them unique powers—not only to restore peace but also to decide when the church was at peace and when it was at war. Peacetime provided an opportunity to rebuild forces, as penitent apostates stood on the threshold of the Christian encampment seeking desperately to enlist.[47] For their martyrdom to be valid, before they could enter the sacred conflict, priests must grant these would-be-soldiers the peace of the earthly church. The priestly sacraments therefore constituted the gateways, carefully guarded in peace but opened wider during times of war. These instruments of peace should not be restricted, duplicated, or abused.

Cyprian wanted to tame martyrs, not eliminate them. For his peacetime army, he recruited veterans of persecution, writing to his deacons and presbyters in favor of "soldiers," whose sufferings in war testified to their humility in peace.[48] In order to fulfill the church's needs in times of both war and peace, he adjusted the definition of martyrdom. The paradigmatic martyr combined valor with discipline.[49] What was valor and glory in combat should in peace change to humility and submission under the bishop. True soldiers were "as sublime in glory as humble in reverence, equally elevated by divine designation as submissive through their repose and tranquility; and equally do they provide examples of bravery and behavior (*virtutum et morum*), fitting

---

44. *De lapsis* 14, 228 and 16, 230.

45. *De lapsis* 36, 241–242.

46. Cyprian, *Ep.* 43.5, 594. Cyprian singled out the rebel Novatus as both an enemy of the church and a second persecution, going so far as to label him a heretic. See *Ep.* 51.1, 614–51.2, 616 and 52.2, 617–618. Novatus was endangering the souls of Christians through discord in the same way that the Roman state had endangered their bodies through prosecution (*Ep.* 52.2, 618).

47. Cyprian, *Ep.* 57.1, 651: "Omnes omnino milites Christi qui arma desiderant et proelium flagitant intra castra dominica colligamus"; *Ep.* 57.3, 652: Interesse debet . . . inter eos qui vel apostataverunt e ad *saeculum* cui renuntiaverant reversi gentiliter vivunt, vel ad haereticos transfugae facti contra ecclesiam parricidalia cotidie arma suscipiunt, et inter eoas qui ab ecclesiae limine non recedentes et inpolorantes iugiter ac dolenter divina et paterna solacia nunc se ad pugnam paratos esse et pro Domini sui nominee ac pro sua salute stare fortiter et pugnare profitentur."

48. Cyprian, *Ep.* 40.1, 585–586.

49. Cyprian, *Ep.* 37.4, 579.

both for battle and for peace."[50] To confessors who accepted his authority in Carthage, Cyprian wrote that he was as delighted at their desire for peace with the church as he had been at the news "of the glory of your confession and the celestial and spiritual praise that you had won in battle."[51] By disciplining the martyrs, Cyprian created a standing army, one that was militaristic both in the ardor of its fighting and in its devotion to peace.

When in 253, news arrived that the emperor Gallus was planning a new persecution, Cyprian announced that the last days had finally arrived.[52] As the day of Antichrist drew near, Cyprian saw ultimate persecution and greatest violence in the formation of an antichurch, an alternate set of priests, deacons, bishops, and worshippers, who represented the advent of Antichrist through reliance on false sacraments.[53] Their schism became heresy when the rebels acted *contra sacramentum et traditum* and tried to supplant a divinely instituted order through mimicry.[54] Rival churches with rival bishops and false sacraments constituted the most virulent attack on the home camp (*castrum domesticum*) because they seduced Christian soldiers of quality and reputation from their proper stations.[55] Given full rein pseudo-bishops would exercise not justice but *potestas*, worldly coercion exemplified by Rome, now rampant within the Christian walls.[56] The trained martyrs

50. Cyprian, *Ep.* 39.4, 584: "Pares ambo et uterque consimiles, in quantum gloria sublimes, in tantum verecundia humiles, quantum divina dignatione promoti, tantum sua quiete et tranquillitate summissi, et virtutum pariter et morum singulis exempla praebentes et congressioni et paci congruentes, illic robore hic pudore laudabiles."

51. Cyprian, *Ep.* 54.1, 621: "Lectis litteris vestris, fratres carissimi, quas ad me de vestra regressione et de ecclesiastica pace ac fraterna redintegratione fecistis, in tantum me laetatum esse confiteor in quantum fueram et ante laetatus quando confessionis vestrae gloriam conperi et militiae vestrae caelestem ac spiritalem laudem gratulabundus excepi."

52. Cyprian, *Ep.* 58.1, 656: "Scire enim debetis et pro certo credere ac tenere pressurae diem super caput esse coepisse et occasum saeculi atque antichristi tempus adpropinquasse." (You should know and believe and hold for certain that the day of affliction is emerging overhead and the death of the world and the time of Antichrist are at hand.)

53. Cyprian, *Ep.* 59.18, 689.

54. Cyprian, *Ep.* 45.1, 600. Writing to the Roman presbyters who opposed Bishop Cornelius, Cyprian uses similar invective: "You have agreed to the creation of another bishop, that is . . . to the institution of an alternate church, the rending of Christ's members, to tearing into pieces the lord's flock, one body and soul, through imitation (*aemulatione*)" (*Ep.* 46.1, 604).

55. Cyprian, *Ep.* 46.2, 605.

56. "What would remain, then," asks Cyprian, except that "church should cede to Capitol," and "and in our church, when the priests have retreated and abandoned the Lord's altar, mimicries and idols from its [heathen] temples must overrun the cherished sanctum?" (*Ep.* 59.18, 687–688: Quid superest quam ut ecclesia Capitolio cedat et recedentibus sacerdotibus ac Domini altare removentibus in cleri nostri sacrum venerandumque congestum simulacra adque idola cum aris suis transeant?)

must now rise up and draw others away from this violence and into the peace of the one, true church.

By refocusing the church's militant energies on the integrity of sacraments, Cyprian had unwittingly ensured that persecution would outlive the Roman Empire. Persecution could emerge from within a seemingly united and peaceful community, meted out by so-called friends, ministered by false apostles. During a life spent confronting the twin dangers of peace and persecution, he struggled regularly against peace unsupervised, reconciliation that did not come via the *episkopos*, God's only conduit on earth.

Cyprian's strictures regarding peace translated into his understanding of the sacraments. There existed valid and invalid sacraments, suggesting that it was possible for there to be a true and a false church, a false peace that snatched away true peace: "pax vera falsae pacis mendacio tollitur."[57] These fears developed during the Donatist controversy into a language of separation, through which Catholics and Donatists accused each other of falsifying and profaning the sacraments, and enjoying a diabolical simulacrum of peace. Cyprian left a language and pattern for the expression of these concerns, but even he could not have foreseen the extent to which peace with the world would affect the ecclesial institution.

It was Cyprian's fate to endure as an exemplar to movements he would never have espoused. Much as the schismatic Donatists might claim him for their own enterprise, Cyprian's entire sacramental theology had evolved around defense of a monolithic and broadly inclusive church; and likewise with the revolutionary movements his sacramental fears inspired in the eleventh century. It has been shown that Cyprian's emphasis on charity as the basis of ecclesiastical unity informed critics of the Gregorian reform, such as the Norman Anonymous, who considered Gregorian arguments of papal supremacy to overreach the essential equality of bishops established by the early church.[58] At the same, the Carthaginian bishop influenced reform's more radical elements. Cyprianist thinking filters, often unattributed, into the writings of Humbert of Silva Candida, perhaps explaining Humbert's insistence on the invalidity of simoniacal sacraments. As the papal reform took shape under Gregory VII and his followers, there circulated an old

57. Cyprian, *Ep.* 59.13, 680.

58. Karl Morrison, *Tradition and Authority in the Western Church, 300–1140* (Princeton, NJ, 1969), 303–304. The more measured *De unitate ecclesiae conservanda* 42, ed. W. Schwenkenbecher, MGH LDL 2:275–276, invokes Cyprian directly. See the discussion of Cyprianist influence in *Tradition and Authority*, 299–300.

Cyprianist watchword: "The Lord said I am the truth, not I am custom."[59] Gregory, more than most, took up Cyprian's suspicion of peace, its potential for promoting lassitude, but most importantly its impact on ecclesiastical discipline: a deleterious and enervating peace constituted the most insidious persecution of the church. Like Cyprian, Gregory saw the solution in protection and monopolization of the sacraments, the gates of authentic peace.

Milan provided Gregory with his first set of authentic martyrs, Christian soldiers for peace, disciplined by a commitment to the integrity of true sacraments. Gregory's espousal of the rebellion of the Pataria, before and during his papal tenure, may have shaped the Patarenes' vocabulary of clerical critique. Certainly, their attacks on the sacraments of Milan's clergy cannot be read as random, or devoid of specific historical and ecclesiological resonance. The archdiocese at the heart of the "Investiture Controversy" was also where Gregory first embarked on turbulent experiments with peace.

The Pataria

Medieval Italians had a proverb: "Milan [excels] in clerics, Pavia in ornaments, Rome in buildings, Ravenna in churches."[60] The bishops and archbishops of these northern Italian cities enjoyed significant territorial and political supremacy over the lay nobility, a legacy of Carolingian emperors who had incorporated military and civic organization under ecclesiastical rather than lay princes. In 840, the Carolingian empire was divided, beginning a slow devolution of political authority onto territorial magnates and metropolitans; subsequent dynasties relied on a balance of alliances to control their bishops, especially in outlying regions like Lorraine and Lombardy.[61] In northern Italy, bishops played

59. Cyprian, *Ep.* 74.9, 806, reformulated (as the Gregorians would eventually pronounce it) at the Council of Carthage (256), according to Ladner, *Idea of Reform*, 138. Cf. John 14.6. While the famous attribution to Gregory VII is dubious, his followers used Cyprian's words. In 1092, Urban II paraphrases this saying in a letter scolding Count Robert of Flanders for his "violent" acquisition of clerical benefices. Urban does not attribute the words to Cyprian (although Cyprian features elsewhere in his letters), which suggests that it had become a commonplace. *Epistolae et privilegia* 70, PL 151:356C: "Quod si praetendis hoc ex antiquo usu in terra tua processisse, scire debes Creatorem tuum dixisse: *Ego sum veritas*, non autem usus vel consuetudo." Morrison, *Tradition and Authority*, 273n and 279.

60. Landulf Senior, *Historia Mediolanensis* 3.1, ed. L. C. Bethmann and W. Wattenbach, MGH SS 8:74.

61. Giovanni Tabacco, *The Struggle for Power in Medieval Italy: Structures of Political Rule*, trans. Rosalind Jensen (Cambridge, 1989), 125–136 and 166–181 for Lombardy. For Lorraine, see John Nightingale, *Monasteries and Patrons in the Gorze Reform: Lotharingia, c. 850–1000* (Oxford, 2001), 71–72.

a major role in the conveyance—we should say representation—of imperial suzerainty. By 1000, northern Italian dioceses had become rival princedoms in their own right. Milan's archbishop, Aribert, ruled Lombardy from the Alps to Liguria in the east and Aquileia in the west. He supervised bishoprics and monasteries within the archdiocese, managed the estates of the church of Milan, and was responsible for the civic administration of the city and its *contado* (hinterland) with access to armies from nearby castellans.[62] In 1026, the archbishop even led military operations to support Conrad II, later crowned emperor, who was asserting his domination of northern Italy.[63]

Despite a political debt to powerful metropolitans like Aribert, emperors still considered it their duty to maintain peace in northern Italy, and in 1036 Conrad crossed the Alps at the behest of the Milanese nobility to discipline the archbishop.[64] In 1056, however, a new Milanese uprising called the Pataria turned not to the emperor but to Rome for help.[65] The rebels may have ignored the imperial court because Emperor Henry III had died that year, leaving his wife and mother regents for the new monarch, who was only a child. However, as Herbert Cowdrey has argued, the turn to a rival like Rome shows the growing political and spiritual influence of the papacy in those twenty years.[66] The presence of a reform movement in Rome energized a minority of non-noble city dwellers (*civitates*), minor notables (*vavasores*), and lords (*capitanei*) in Milan, who had radicalized against the customs of their own church.

The Patarenes claimed to represent the populace at large, and while such claims may have been more aspirational than realistic, such a self-imagining makes them distinctive. Both pro- and anti-Patarene sources reveal that the leaders were *vavasores* and *capitanei*, although alienated from

62. Cowdrey, "Patarenes," 25; Tabacco, *Struggle for Power*, 184–187; and general treatment in Tabacco, "Northern and Central Italy in the Eleventh Century," *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. 4, ed. D. Luscombe and J. Riley-Smith (Cambridge, 2004), 80–83.

63. Herwig Wolfram, *Conrad II, 990–1039: Emperor of Three Kingdoms*, trans. Denise Kaiser (University Park, PA, 2006), 118. Arnulf of Milan claims Conrad explicitly tied his coronation to the efforts of the Milanese see and insisted that the archbishop or his representative should lead him to the imperial consecration. See *Commemoratio superbie Ravennatis Archiepiscopi*, ed. Claudia Zey, MGH SSrGs 67:251.

64. On Aribert's domination and the knightly response, see H. E. J. Cowdrey, "Archbishop Aribert II of Milan," *History: The Journal of the Historical Association* 2 (1966): 1–15.

65. Cowdrey, "Patarenes," 25.

66. Ibid., 28–29. Regarding Milan's internal instability after Aribert's death, see Violante, *La Pataria Milanese*, 2.

their diverse social origins.[67] Of course, knowing the social status of the leaders does not tell us about the composition of the movement as a whole. The chronicles of Arnulf of Milan, Landulf Senior, and the Patarene partisan Andrew of Strumi suggest that the rebels were mostly laypersons, aided by some disaffected clerics.

As a self-appointed government of citizens and inhabitants opposed to episcopal administration, the movement presaged the later Italian communes, but unlike the communes, it lacked majority support. And the people's support was critical. The wars of 1036 had established their decisive influence in disputes between ecclesial and lay princes. In 1036 the Milanese had repelled Conrad's forces with the famous *plaustrum* or *caroccio*, an ox-drawn war chariot that would later become a symbol for Italian communal armies.[68] It is tempting to speculate that this same newly formed civic identity then turned on its head and spurred collective resistance to the bishop as the Pataria movement. However, the leadership of the Pataria and the popular resistance to it suggest that it could as easily have been yet another case of lesser nobility defying metropolitan authority after the death of a powerful archbishop.

The movement emerged around 1056, when Ariald, a deacon, began to preach clerical celibacy and poverty. Between 1056 and 1075, the Pataria attacked the clergy of Milan, while the papacy began to treat the revolt as a holy war against bad custom. Inspired by Byzantine ceremonial, the Milanese church maintained different rituals and customs from Rome. When overhauling church ceremonies in the late sixth century, Pope Gregory I had avoided a liturgical dispute with Milan, since peace and unity of the church trumped ritual uniformity.[69] Eleventh-century papal reformers felt differently about local custom: just as custom had kept the church captive to the empire, it had wedded Milan to stultifying and sinful practices. As a result, the Milanese church was rife with the two great targets of papal reform:

---

67. Cowdrey, "Patarenes," 31–32: and Edward Coleman, "Representative Assemblies in Communal Italy," in *Political Assemblies in the Earlier Middle Ages*, ed. P. S. Barnwell and Marco Mostert (Turnhout, 2003), 196–200. Some *patarini*, like the priest Lidprand, did come from humble or clerical backgrounds, but their spokesman, Ariald, was born into a knightly family, and his lay allies Erlembald and Landulf came from the *capitanei*, the urban elite, who held fiefs in church lands within and outside the city.

68. Arnulf, *Liber gestorum* 2.16, 161. Edward Coleman, "Italian Communes: Recent Work and Current Trends," *Journal of Medieval History* 25.4 (1999): 392–393. Also see Cowdrey, "Patarenes"; and Wolfram, *Conrad II*, 120–131.

69. Bonizo, *Liber ad amicum* 6, 591.

simony (trading in the sacraments) and nicolaitism (clerical concubinage). Concubinage had become a special feature of the Milanese church because of recent strictures against clerical marriage.[70]

In Roman eyes, the Patarenes had provided the first insurrection in the name of apostolic reform. But initially, the papacy remained unsure of whether to welcome them as true apostles or to suppress them as enemies of peace.[71] By 1050, the popes had begun to style themselves peacemakers to all Christendom, responsible for the maintenance of unity, morality, and doctrinal harmony in both the Latin and Greek churches. Such universal peacemakers could not take sides in an internal political dispute, nor could they attempt to shift the power balances of a rival princedom without having legitimate reasons for interference. The Milanese clergy was also invoking the ancient papal instructions that peace must transcend differences in custom. Finally, could the popes assist laymen against the authority of a prelate, who had been ordained by God and installed by the will of clergy and people?

To negotiate the problem on the papacy's behalf, the hermit-reformer Peter Damian visited Milan in 1059. He found himself "in a difficult position," for, as he demonstrated in a letter to the fiery reformer Hildebrand, the future Gregory VII, several canonical authorities had previously made allowances for seemingly reprobate regional practices.[72] Unable to denounce Milanese custom simply on the authority of church tradition, Damian resorted to apostolic authority, wryly commending Hildebrand for demonstrating how effective that approach could be.[73] Although the archbishop, Guy, could not control his flock, and the clergy and people cherished their "Ambrosian customs" to the point of going to war, the real disorder was the "violence" done to the faith when the Milanese church favored its own traditions over the dictates of Rome.[74] At Damian's insistence, Guy imposed an oath of

70. Violante, *La Pataria Milanese*, 14–15.

71. Bonizo, *Liber ad amicum* 6, 592, speaks of an exploratory delegation sent by Pope Stephen and consisting of Hildebrand (future Pope Gregory VII) and Anselm I of Lucca (future Pope Alexander II; see Dümmler's note 1 ad loc.). According to Bonizo, they made little progress toward any settlement; unable to make contact with the archbishop, they spent their time preaching. However, this initial look at the Pataria must have influenced their policy in the years to come.

72. Peter Damian, *Epistola* 65, in *Die Briefe des Petrus Damiani*, vol. 2, ed. K. Reindel, MGH Epp: Die Briefe der deutschen Kaizerzeit (Munich, 1988), 236–240.

73. Damian, *Ep.* 65, 235.

74. Damian, *Ep.* 65, 234: "Fidem quippe violat, qui adversus illam agit, que mater est fidei, et illi contumax invenitur, qui eam cunctis aecclesiis praetulisse cognoscitur." In the 1080s, Bonizo argued that Ambrose himself had written that those who withdrew from the authority of the Roman church were heretics. See *Liber ad amicum*, 6.

moral purity on his priests and acknowledged the popes as his exemplars in the war against simony and nicolaitism.[75] In return, Damian allowed even priests suspected of simony to resume their duties, "not on account of the ordination that they had bought in so vile a manner" but on the authority of Saint Peter.[76] In short, papal emissaries had begun to recast an internal crisis in papal terms.

Over the next few years, the papacy would style the Pataria and its sister uprisings in Cremona, Brescia, and Piacenza simply as obedience transferred from disorderly churches to the church in Rome.[77] But as Hildebrand increased his influence at court, papal support for the movement became overt, even incendiary. Here in northern Italy was a proxy for reformist aspirations in Rome. The Paterenes were true soldiers of Christ enacting divine retribution on Satan's army. In 1066, a letter from Pope Alexander II's court urged the Cremonese:[78]

> Therefore let each of you say, with the sword of divine virtue on his belt: "If anyone is for the Lord, let him be bound to me."
>
> And, like Moses, when the shining warrior rushed from door to door of the encampments against the sacrileges, so let him close with the bodies of the fallen the gates of simoniacal veniality and clerical adultery by which the devil has infiltrated your church.

In response, the people of Cremona and Piacenza expelled their excommunicated bishops and swore new oaths (*sacramenta*) to the Pataria.[79]

The papal position was tenuous, given that the Pataria regularly used force against clerics. Ariald declared that priests in a state of sin would be unable to perform valid sacraments. His lay brethren assaulted clerics who lived unchastely, forbade other Christians from entering their churches, and

---

75. Damian, *Ep.* 65, 240–242.

76. Damian, *Ep.* 65, 246. Subsequent papal apologists, like Bonizo, applauded Damian's pragmatism. *Liber ad amicum* 6, 593.

77. Bonizo, *Liber ad amicum* 6, 596–597.

78. A letter supposedly from Alexander, the only extant copy of which is in Bonizo, *Liber ad amicum* 6, 597: "Igitur unusquisque vestrum divinae virtutis mucrone precinctus dicat: 'Si quis est Domini, iungatur mecum'; sicque cum Moyse quasi de porta in portam castrorum tanquam fervidus bellator in sacrilegos irruat, ut symoniacae venalitatis et clericalis adulterii ianuas, per quas diabolus in vestram fuerat ingressus ecclesiam, cesis cadaveribus claudat." Ian Robinson, ed., *The Papal Reform of the Eleventh Century: Lives of Pope Leo IX and Gregory VII* (Manchester, 2004), 212 n. 122 informs us that this letter (Jaffé 4637) is known only from Bonizo's account.

79. Bonizo, *Liber ad amicum* 6, 598: "Omnes Patarenses per sacramenta confirmant."

forcibly dragged priests from the altar during Mass; imitators in Cremona flogged their bishop at the Easter service.[80] Through civic disorder and physical disruption of illicit sacraments, the Paterenes and their imitators accomplished many of the goals that reformers in Rome had set for themselves but had been unable to fulfill. Between 1049 and 1054, Leo IX had attacked clerical abuses through legislation and sermons, urging a return to the apostolic and pilgrim church of the early religion, but at best he had partially succeeded in invalidating the sacraments of sinful bishops. Even his fiercest courtiers had not gone so far as to physically block ceremonies. The Pataria meanwhile had formed their own clergy to offer true sacraments and preaching: a small, self-governing, shadow church at odds with the established leadership in Milan.

Their small size and eagerness for martyrdom meant that, unlike the sprawling papacy, the Pataria easily conformed to medieval images of the hunted early church. While Leo governed from a curia or papal court, and traveled with a retinue, the Pataria insisted that they were *pauperes*. The term *pauperes Christi*, or "poor of Christ," had found great currency around 1000 in the French Peace of God movement. Then, *pauperes* had meant, among other things, those who lacked access to weapons, and, in the case of monks who were trying to free themselves from service to traveling armies, those who renounced armed conflict. However, the urban, merchant-based Pataria took *pauperes* to simply mean those who lacked wealth and finery, not weapons.[81] They espoused a life of radical simplicity but welcomed combat, as they imagined early Christians must have done during the late antique Roman persecutions.

When Arialdo was murdered in 1066, the movement found its paradigmatic martyr, and a confirmation that the Patarenes were in a holy war. His enemies kidnapped and tortured Arialdo to death, the corpse found months later in Lake Maggiore. Now sole leader, Erlembald demanded that the body be turned over to the reformers. According to the Patarene chronicler Andrew of Strumi, when the episcopal government refused, Erlembald urged his followers: "Since God's and our enemies will not freely (*gratis*) return the saint, [Arialdo] should be removed by us from them with violence."[82] The contrast here is between violence and freedom: the same action could be performed under duress or as an act of grace. Andrew uses the passive

80. Cowdrey, "Patarenes," 30. Bonizo of Sutri applauds them. *Liber ad amicum* 6, 597.

81. Lester Little, *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy in Medieval Europe* (Ithaca, NY, 1978), 67–83, discusses the relationship of poverty to bearing of arms and redefinitions of poverty among hermits and contemplatives (including Damian) in the context of urban growth in the late eleventh century.

82. Andrew of Strumi, *Vita Sancti Arialdi* 23, ed. F. Baethgen, MGH SS 30.2:1070.

voice to imply that the clergy of Milan have invited violence on themselves. Erlembald then made a distinction regarding the nature of this violence: that it should be armed coercion rather than mere robbery, since God's work was pursued openly according to justice and honor.[83] This set the pattern for the final decade of the Patarene uprising: open conflict in order to bend, rather than undermine, the will of the Milanese clergy.

Accordingly, their leader put the Pataria on a war footing: critics like Arnulf describe how Erlembald collected mercenaries, rode around heavily armed, and eventually forbade the Easter baptisms by destroying the chrism. Erlembald also adopted the accoutrements of a warrior but wore a hermit's vest under his clothes.[84] After 1066, as William the Conqueror and Enguerrand the Coucy were taking up the banner of Saint Peter, the leader of the Pataria also began to flourish the *vexillum Sancti Petri*. Years after the Pataria's demise, friends of the papacy imagined the Paterenes to have been fighting a holy war similar to those being conducted in Spain and England.[85] Just as the *vexillum* to Ebles can be read as a precedent to the Crusades, the banner to Erlembald became a prototype for future disciplinary actions by the papacy on wayward Christians. Writing in the late 1080s, Bonizo of Sutri calls Erlembald a "soldier of God" and compares him to Judas Maccabeus at several points in his reformist apologia, *A Book to a Friend*.[86]

The greatest encouragement of course came from Archdeacon Hildebrand. In his 1059 letter to Hildebrand, Peter Damian had assured him that peace would return to Milan once papal primacy had been acknowledged. Damian sympathized with the general reformist aims of the Paterenes but preferred compromise to rebellion. But, according to Arnulf of Milan and Landulf Senior, two chroniclers with extreme antipathy toward the Pataria, Hildebrand did everything to *encourage* discord.[87] The archdeacon overbore Pope Alexander, who also preferred caution and had heard reports of the Pataria's brutality.[88] According to Landulf Senior, when Arialdand Erlembald came to Rome in 1066, Alexander delayed over whether to give

83. Andrew, *Vita Sancti Arialdi* 23, 1070.

84. Cowdrey, "Patarenes," 35.

85. For a circumspect consideration of the Pataria as proto-Crusade, see Cinzio Violante, "La Pataria e la 'Militia Dei' nelle fonti e nelle la realita," in *"Militia Christi" e Crociata nei secoli XI-XIII: Atti della undecima Settimana internazionale di studio, Mendola, 28 agosto–1 settembre 1989*, Miscellanea del Centro di Studi Medioevali 13 (Milan, 1992), 103–127.

86. See Bonizo, *Liber ad amicum* 6, 599.

87. Cowdrey, *Gregory VII*, 70.

88. Ibid., 68–69.

the Paterenes aid, "seeing that there might be grave danger in inciting civil war."[89] While the pope pondered, Ariald rushed to Hildebrand, "monk-turned-chancellor," who from the Lateran palace "ruled the Roman military like a general [*imperator*: note the loaded term]." Landulf reports that finally "Alexander and Hildebrand with a single accord in the presence of all" gave the Patarenes the banner along with the papal blessing.[90]

After Ariald's death that same year, Hildebrand pushed the Patarenes to new revolts against custom. He told Erlembald not to seek imperial ratification of a new archbishop when Guy died; instead they needed Rome's consent.[91] After Guy's death in 1071, Hildebrand and Erlembald chose an inexperienced cleric named Atto, who would most likely be a papal and Patarene puppet. The Milanese clergy and people revolted against this disdain for custom and canon, since it was their prerogative to elect an archbishop—and the right of the imperial court to ratify it. They forcibly removed Atto and made him swear to give up any intention to be archbishop. Apparently, Hildebrand (who had not until then rebuked popular coercion of the Milanese clergy) suddenly became concerned about "violence" in the city and ruled that since Atto had been coerced, his oath of renunciation did not count.[92]

By the time Hildebrand became pope in 1073, he had made his position clear on the Pataria, pursuing a combination of military and spiritual aggression with or without the full consent of his superior in Rome. It is likely that he saw in Ariald a reflection of his own uncompromising enthusiasm for hyperascetic reform. The two appeared in reformist circles at about the same time, each adopted an austere lifestyle (despite Landulf's assertions about his princely behavior, Hildebrand was known for his simple garb and vegetarian diet), and both embraced the temporal sword of military might as long as it supported the spiritual sword of the gospel. After Ariald's death, Hildebrand took Erlembald under his wing and served as the movement's spirit, his authority enhanced by the fact that their most senior

89. Landulf Senior, *Historia* 3.15, 83.

90. Landulf Senior, *Historia* 3.15, 84.

91. Per Cowdrey, *Gregory VII*, 68–69, "the issue of canonical election was thus thrown into sharp focus at Milan by Hildebrand's agency." As pope, Gregory wrote to Erlembald in 1073 assuring him that he and the emperor would be in agreement regarding the Milanese investiture. Gregory, *Epistola* 1.25, in *Das Register Gregors VII*, ed. E. Caspar, MGH Epp. sel. 2.1 (Berlin, 1920), 42 (henceforth Greg. *Reg.*).

92. Arnulf, *Liber gestorum* 4.2, 206; Cowdrey, *Gregory VII*, 70. But see Bonizo, *Liber ad amicum* 6, 599, which makes the contrary argument that Pope Alexander dismissed the oath after receiving general agreement from the cardinal-bishops and other clergy of Rome.

priest, Lidprand, was of humble stature. Erlembald's secular grandeur seems not to have fazed Hildebrand-Gregory as long as the former remained obedient to exhortations from the papal court. Ultimately, it was the Patarene cause that brought Gregory into direct confrontation with King Henry IV, when Erlembald's efforts to create a puppet archbishop had failed. There can be no greater testament to Gregory's devotion to the Pataria than the fact that the "Investiture Controversy," which shadowed the end of the eleventh century, directly refers to the contest over the investiture of a new archbishop in Milan.

In 1075, the radical wing of the Milanese reform collapsed spectacularly. Ariald's death and Hildebrand's relative distance from Milan had allowed Erlembald to take over the movement, and to intensify physical attacks on clergy and any other dissenters, while the papacy had ignored popular resentment of the bloody civil war.[93] Yet, according to Arnulf, it was not bloodshed that finally forced the hand of the Milanese but rather the consciousness of sacramental violence combined with a scriptural injunction to insurrection. In 1075 a fire destroyed large parts of the city, and the Milanese blamed the Pataria, who now dominated the city.[94] To exacerbate matters, Erlembald once again tried to insinuate his own Easter chrism, and according to Arnulf, the priest Lidprand "usurped" the office of the ministrants (*ordinariorum*) and began to baptize indiscriminately. Infuriated by the violence (*violentia*) of Lidprand's illicit occupation of a sacramental office, the citizens and knights rebelled, Arnulf tells us, recalling that even the "Book of Romans" counseled resistance in the face of harsh masters.[95]

Rising up against sacramental violence, the Milanese mob killed Erlembald and mutilated the priest Lidprand by cutting off his nose and ears. Arnulf choreographs the retribution as a liturgy. The people stripped naked the battered corpse of Erlembald to bring him down from the great eminence he had attained; they denied him funeral rites. They mutilated Lidprand, saying he should lose what seemed his own because he had presumed to attain a distinction that was alien to him. In triumph, the citizenry marched into the Ambrosiana church, singing hymns and brandishing weapons. The next day they held Mass, confessed and received absolution for all crimes,

93. Bonizo, *Liber ad amicum* 6, 599, describes Erlembald's defeat of Atto's rival Godfrey's army in 1072 as *incruentam victoriam*, a "bloodless victory," obtained through God's mercy.

94. See Arnulf, *Liber gestorum* 4.8, 212–214 on the fire; and Bonizo, *Liber ad amicum* 6, 599 on the reprisals.

95. See Arnulf, *Liber gestorum* 4.9, 214–215.

and "went home in peace."[96] As clearly as the radical reformers, Arnulf read bloodshed in Milan as iterations of a great sacrament.

The final act of the spectacle should have been a return to traditional authority: the resumption of imperial discipline over the pretensions of papal reform. In fact, clergy and people had called Henry IV of Germany to their aid and sworn to accept an imperial candidate for archbishop.[97] However, Henry made a mistake that he would repeat several times during his reign by appointing a friend, in this case a young, obscure priest named Tedald. Offended that the local candidate, Godfrey, had been passed over, the Milanese clergy turned to the papacy, and even enemies of the Pataria like the chronicler Arnulf asked Gregory to forgive them for resisting the Roman reform.

Although shattered by news of the Paterene downfall, Gregory worked quickly. In December of 1075, he sent letters to the bishops within Milan's archdiocese, forbidding them to consecrate Tedald without papal approval. He wrote to Tedald, calling him a rebel and renegade who had supported king over pope and had occupied the seat of a living bishop, the papal nominee Atto. Gregory insisted that Atto's removal was invalid and had been exposed as such by the use of armed force.[98] Finally, he elevated the badly wounded Lidprand to quasi martyrdom, ensuring that the Milanese reform retained an inspirational, spiritual leader on the ground.

Late in 1075, the pope wrote to Lidprand:[99]

> You may with better reason believe that the office of priesthood is now in you because what was formerly committed to you by anointing with oil has now in truth been committed to you by washing with blood . . . for we know that you are thus always viewed with enmity and afflicted by the enemies of holy church, but you should neither fear them nor be afraid, because with great charity we are keeping both you and all that is yours under our protection and that of the apostolic see.

---

96. Arnulf, *Liber gestorum* 4.9–4.10, 214–217.

97. Cowdrey, "Paterenes," 39, argues that the defeat of the Pataria actually helped Gregory's reformist program in Milan, since this violent wing of reform "defeated the ends which he sponsored them to serve."

98. Greg, *Reg.* 3.8–10, 259–267. In fact, Gregory himself was guilty of all these things: he had avowedly rebelled and encouraged rebellion; he had encouraged armed force against the enemies of the papacy, including other clergymen; and he had removed numerous priests and bishops from their sees by determining that they had obtained their office through simony.

99. "Appendix 2," *The Register of Pope Gregory VII, 1073–1085: An English Translation*, ed. and trans. H. E. J. Cowdrey (Oxford, 2002), 445. The Caspar edition of Gregory's *Register* is missing this letter.

Gregory had developed his vision of the church as renovation and liberation extending from center to periphery, from spirit to flesh. To him, Milan's uprising read as a physical affirmation of reformist teachings: the rupture of all bonds of illicit obedience. Milanese violence against the sacraments had expressed itself in civil war and etched itself on the face of Lidprand.

Alongside grief, therefore, the letter displays exultation. Through his injuries, the priest had become a testament to the dichotomy between spirit and flesh: "The visible form is more base, but the image of God, which is the form of righteousness, had been made more fair in diminution, more beautiful in baseness."[100] Historians Norman Cohn and more recently Philippe Buc have examined how millennial expectation, a consciousness of end times, becomes a call to action and an injunction to violence in religious movements with a self-image of patient suffering.[101] A similar argument can be made for mind-body dichotomies, when the radical separation of spirit and flesh prepares the faithful for martyrdom. The papal rhetoric that evolved in the wake of the Patrene collapse expresses both these tendencies.

For Gregory, the hideously deformed Lidprand was like the church itself, as typified in the Song of Songs: "I am black and beautiful, daughters of Jerusalem."[102] After Constantine's liberation of the church, the Donatist Tyconius had written that "black and beautiful" meant Christians must accept the material taints that came with an earthly victory.[103] Gregory reversed the image by giving it a pre-Constantinian context. Citing his love for Lidprand, Gregory compared himself to the liberating emperor, who kissed the empty eye socket of a bishop whom pagans had mutilated during the Great Persecution.[104] Milan's plight showed that the church of apostles was still captive. Its persecution had become apparent once again, and Lidprand's scars were its testimony.

The events of the Patarene uprising brought together two key elements of the Gregorian revolution: fear of captivity by impure sacraments and the welcoming of physical force for the purposes of liberation. The sacraments were the basis of peace in church and world, and their desecration brought

100. *Register of Pope Gregory VII*, 445.

101. Norman Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium* (Fairlawn, NJ, 1957), esp. 71–107 and 198–280, with regard to holy war and reformist insurrection, Philippe Buc, "Some Thoughts on the Christian Theology of Violence, Medieval and Modern, from the Middle Ages to the French Revolution," *Rivista di storia del Cristianesimo* 5 (2008): 14–15.

102. *Register of Pope Gregory VII*, 445.

103. Tyconius, *Liber regularum* 2, ed. and trans. William S. Babcock (Atlanta, 1989), 18.

104. *Register of Pope Gregory VII*, 445.

disorder and entrapment. Sacramental captivity constituted the basic, hidden form of violence, and it took civil war to make this violence apparent. If observers read Lidprand's countenance correctly, disorder had a positive side: external horror pointed to the beauty of a new wakening for the church. Open warfare, an active indictment, was essential to the task of liberation.

This was powerful language because it was shared language. As the semantic of Lidprand's mutilation shows, both sides had begun to read and interpret acts of compulsion and physical injury. And the Milanese reversal after the fall of the Pataria demonstrates that even opponents shared the primary concerns of the reform papacy: the question of sacramental integrity and the fear of "violent" entrapment when sacraments were impugned or usurped.[105] As he decried Erlembald's travesty of the Easter chrism, Arnulf used the same vocabulary of bondage and liberation, community and consortium, that Pope Gregory reserved for opponents of his reformist vision. To the reformers, Erlembald was destroying a pseudosacrament, one already spoiled by the sins of the Milanese clergy, and freighted with the chains of excommunication, but Arnulf saw him laying a snare for the unwary, denying them grace and pulling them into his "consortium" of wickedness.[106] In both cases, sacramental action had been negated and reversed, resulting in diabolical captivity.

The Patarene uprising did not become a foundational memory for Milanese communal identity. Instead, the twelfth-century Milanese annals date their civic history from great victories won in 1061 against rival Italian cities.[107] However, the insurrection did have a significant impact on the reformist imaginary, and especially on the policy and polemic of papal reform's implacable instigator, Gregory VII. By the time the Pataria fell, Gregory's vision of open combat encompassed all Christendom. The mutilated martyrs of Milan exemplified worldly persecution that had remained hidden under the cover of peace, and Henry IV's late involvement in the movement's demise implicated the king in this persecution of the church.

With his suspicions of false peace validated and exaggerated by civil war, the pope redirected his theology of insurrection against Henry IV, and against

105. Cf. Cowdrey, "Patarenes," 33 and 39, who argues that Patarene violence inhibited nascent reformist impulses in Milan. Although he had opposed the rebels, Arnulf objected that the same priests who consecrated Henry's candidate had previously consecrated another bishop, Godfrey, who was still alive. *Liber gestorum* 5.5, 222–224.

106. Arnulf, *Liber gestorum* 4.6, 210–211.

107 Chris Wickham, "The Sense of the Past in Twelfth-Century City Chronicles," *Land and Power: Studies in Italian and European Social History, 400–1200* (London, 1994), 309.

clerical submission to royal theocracy. Alarmed, other clergymen warned Gregory that in pursuit of an apostolic government beyond the reach of flawed humanity he risked destabilizing the foundational concord of the world. It would require Christians to renounce the very sacraments that bound subjects to rulers. Critics recalled to the pope the destruction of Jerusalem, when its king Zedekiah broke an oath of subjection to his harsh overlord Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon. Schooled by the disorder of Milan and the destruction of its reformers, a different pontiff might have heeded the analogy. Instead, Gregory chose to see insurrection, conflict, and bloodshed as essential to the destruction of debilitating bonds of false peace.

Insurrection as Liberation from Violent Sacraments

If we understand "sacrament" as a bond more than a ritual, and its misuse as enchainment, the church reformers' spiritual concerns and political conduct become consistent. Erlembald's destruction of a chrism consecrated by tainted priests encapsulates the papal justification for revolt: liberation from the bondage of illicit sacraments. Arnulf's response to its replacement demonstrates a shared fear: violence as the usurpation and falsification of earthly conduits of divine intervention. It also becomes apparent that at a local level these anxieties registered even among clergymen who did not subscribe to the entire papal reform program. By the end of the eleventh century, accusations of sacramental violence featured in regionally circumscribed disputes, especially when papal observers participated in the litigation process.

The Pataria presaged several subversions of a bishop's authority during the late eleventh century, as popes and German kings competed to interfere in the affairs of metropolitan churches. In 1069, canons in Constance appealed to Pope Alexander against their bishop Charles, a royal appointee whom they accused of simony. On Hildebrand's advice, Alexander directed Archbishop Siegfried of Mainz to deny Charles consecration, and, in 1071, King Henry was forced to retract support for his own appointee.[108] The destruction of harmful bonds had become a mainstay of papal reform measures by the end of the eleventh century, as even churchmen were encouraged to revolt against illicit leaders.

Gregory's immediate successors, Victor III and Urban II, were former monks, and unlike Gregory, whose monastic career has not been corroborated,

108. Berthold, *Annales*, Anno 1071, ed. G. H. Pertz, MGH SS 5:275; Cowdrey, *Gregory VII*, 87–88.

they had long served within the discipline of a monastery.[109] Exiled in France for much of his tenure, Urban expanded Gregory's vocabulary of captivity, focusing on the liberation of monasteries. Urban presented his reformist program as care for the integrity of sacraments. The presence of an illicit sacrament justified insurrection even from the exemplars of religious obedience, monks, and even against their ecclesiastical superiors, abbots and bishops. Without such insurrection, monks would not be able to obtain the peace that was essential to their service in the world.

For Urban, unlawful assumption of a sacramental office must be designated invasion and violence. He intervened along these lines on behalf of the abbey of Saint-Hubert of Amdain against the bishop of Liège, who had replaced their abbot. In the 1096, Urban advised the monks of Saint-Hubert of Amdain to break their vows of obedience to the new abbot in defiance of Bishop Otbert, an ally of Henry. According to the abbey's chronicle, Urban made himself clear in 1098: "We have heard, and having heard are unable to refrain from grieving, that by the violence of the pseudobishop Otbert, our venerable son, Theodore, your abbot . . . is expelled, and Wiredus, the pseudomonk is inflicted upon your head by the violence of the same Otbert."[110] Urban called Wiredus and his subordinates "invaders" of the monastery and pronounced excommunication on them for the violence they had perpetrated.

The term "violence" (*violentia*) appears occasionally in monastic chronicles and petitions, but it is not always synonymous with "robbery" (*rapina*), "cruelty" (*crudelitas*), and "plunder" (*praeda*)—terms that monks used to describe their enemies. During the late eleventh century, it seems to have been useful vocabulary when demanding papal intervention not just over the claims of lay lords but also those of bishops, especially since it targeted concerns shared by the reform popes. In 1095, Urban issued a bull of protection to the abbey of Molesme, over and above the advocacy of the bishop of Langres, in which he specified that no *violentia* should be perpetrated in the election of an abbot, who should be chosen according to reverence (*timor*) of God and adherence to the Benedictine Rule.[111] We cannot be certain what form

109. Victor was formerly Abbot Desiderius of Monte Cassino, and Urban was Odo, at one time a canon regular and then prior of Cluny.

110. *Chronicon sancti Huberti Andaginensis* 92, ed. L. C. Bethmann and W. Wattenbach, MGH SS 8:624 (henceforth *CSH*).

111. Bede K. Lackner, *The Eleventh-Century Background of Cîteaux* (Washington, DC, 1972), 237–238n.

that *violentia* might have taken at Molesme, but the association is with cheating (*surreptio*); thus "violence" likely refers to usurpation, a stolen election. Usurpation is clearly connoted in the case of Saint-Hubert, the term *violentia* following a reformist obsession with captivity and insurrection. It refers to the bishop's illicit ministry and to the imposition of his henchmen on the monastic leadership: captivity, presented in this case as diabolical possession. The fact that Wiredus was a "false" monk became critical to the accusation of violence, because Bishop Otbert had substituted the appropriate subject of a binding vow with a decoy.

Urban's missive was one of several assaults on Bishop Otbert, whose plight is an extreme version of the local impact of the Investiture Controversy. Lorraine (Lotharingia) was a region of divided loyalties, an imperial frontier that had produced early papal reformers. Its count, Godfrey the Bearded, had remained a papal ally till his death in 1069.[112] His successor, Godfrey the Hunchback, then sided with King Henry. Otbert's diocese lay on the western edge of lower Lorraine near Flanders-Hainault, whose counts had fought the German emperors and supported the reform popes. Many monasteries in the diocese of Liège had also given their obedience to the papacy against King Henry. However, Bishop Otbert was Henry's man, appointed by the king. He would provide a refuge for the king's final years after Henry's son had driven him from court.[113] In this way, papal and imperial rivalry bifurcated loyalties away from Rome and Aachen.[114]

After his appointment in 1094, Otbert began to reform monasteries in his diocese, ostensibly in accordance with King Henry's desires. He replaced several church officials, including abbots who had previously been removed by papal order, and ejected Abbot Berengar of Saint-Lawrence.[115] Otbert drove Berengar into exile and appointed a replacement, actions that generated opposition from several quarters. Thanks to his imperial appointment Otbert was already regarded as a simoniac, a priest who had bought his office.

---

112. Godfrey's granddaughter Mathilda of Tuscany-Canossa became Gregory VII's most powerful ally.

113. John Van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz* (Berkeley, 1983), 28–30.

114. See the opposing view of John S. Ott, "Both Mary and Martha: Bishop Lietbertus of Cambrai and the Construction of Episcopal Sanctity in a Border Diocese around 1100," in *The Bishop Reformed: Studies of Episcopal Power and Culture in the Central Middle Ages*, ed. John S. Ott and Anna Trumbore Jones (Aldershot, UK, 2007), 144–147, who argues that we should avoid partisan labels such as "Gregorian" with reference to a bishop like Lietbertus of Cambrai, who also presided over a borderland diocese.

115. Van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz*, 28–30.

Now, Berengar and his monks took refuge with Abbot Theodore of Saint-Hubert, who accompanied them into exile in the diocese of Reims. From Saint-Lawrence itself, the monk Rupert of Deutz compared Otbert to Judas and later wrote two scholarly tracts on Judas's communion that implicitly denied Otbert the power to ordain priests.[116] In 1095, Archbishop Hugh of Lyons assembled a synod to denounce Otbert.[117] Pope Urban excommunicated Otbert that same year, a sentence reiterated in 1098.[118] According to the Saint-Hubert chronicle, Otbert retaliated by expelling Abbot Theodore, replacing him with Wiredus, and "violently" removing brothers who dissented.[119]

Even if vindictive, Otbert's actions were no more "violent" than those of bishops who had preceded him, and neither were his policies so different. Reform of Lotharingian monasteries dates from the start of the tenth century, constituting a rebuilding exercise after Norman invasions.[120] Along the Meuse and Moselle, the bishops of Metz, Toul and Verdun, restored the personnel and property of monasteries and nunneries like Gorze, Saint-Evre, and Saint-Maximin.[121] The reorganization of land and memory was a contentious process because abbeys conducted property transactions among nobles, peasants, and princes of the church. Master narratives of feudal society tend to collapse these relationships into a simplistic model of marauding knights and victimized monks, a model that has only recently been dismantled. In fact, the monastic existence could not easily be separated from more worldly ties of kinship and service, nor was there much advantage in doing so, given the complexity of political relationships in Lotharingia.

Shorn of the excesses of Urban's description, Otbert's interference in Saint-Hubert in the 1090s was no different from the turbulent but productive friendships between monastery and prelate that Lotharingia had seen over the past 150 years. While Otbert's predecessors had earned labels like

---

116. *Chronica sancti Laurentii Leodiensis* 48–49, ed. W. Wattenbach, MGH SS 8:278–279 (attributed to Rupert). His arguments refuting the communion of Judas, *Commentaria in evangelium sancti Iohannis* and *De divinis officiis*, are discussed below in chapter 4.

117. *CSH* 72, 606.

118. Although Pope Paschal II remitted the excommunications of almost all imperial bishops at the Synod of Guastalla (1106), he refused to forgive the wretched Otbert. As mentioned above, he also directed Count Robert of Flanders to attack Liège.

119. *CSH* 72, 606.

120. M. Parisse, "Contexte politique," in *L'abbaye de Gorze au Xe siècle*, ed. Michel Parisse and Otto G. Oexle (Nancy, 1993), 64.

121. See chapter 1 above.

"lover of peace," in the wake of the Gregorian revolution, monks had begun to appeal directly to the papacy in order to sort out quarrels within their diocese, and as a result the conversation had shifted. Traditional acts of "peacemaking" had become "invasion" and "violence." The slippage from peace to violence within the language of these contentious friendships not only helps illuminate the contingent nature of the terms but also shows how broad movements of ecclesiastical change registered in local politics.

Insurrection was the only answer to violence. As Gregory VII's Christian soldiers in northern Italy had destroyed concord for the sake of liberation from empire, the monks of Saint Hubert must now break their vows in order to gain freedom. Urban urged the monks to rebel: "I grant you license, that if in your monastery you are not able to live according to the Rule of the blessed Benedict, and the Apostolic truth, you may secede to any other religious monastery, until God omnipotent has a regard for your place, and according to His pleasure, it reforms in a pristine state."[122] Then, not content just with granting permission, Urban warned any monk who refused to "convert away" that he would join Otbert in the bonds of excommunication.[123]

At the end of the eleventh century, litigating churchmen shared with popes a vocabulary of violence and peacemaking. They accepted that illicit governance was a reversal of sacramental benefit, an unholy communion. They signaled their new loves, loyalties, and friendships by transforming bishops from peacemakers to bringers of violence. Violence meant coercive captivity by means of an illicit bond or false sacrament of peace. Fears of false sacraments arose from a confusion of loyalties at a time when the two highest authorities in the church diametrically opposed one another. Christians had to choose between two churches, one supposedly held together by bonds of true peace, and the other seduced by false. Since they were mirror images, it was difficult for uneducated Christians to tell these churches apart. It did not help that intellectuals who claimed greater discernment were equally divided over papal and imperial claims of sovereignty.

As true peace became a source of appeal in ecclesiastical disputes, the language of litigation shaped itself around the main concerns of the papal reform: bad or inverted sacraments. At Liège, Otbert's enemies portrayed him as such a mirror sacrament. The papacy's ally in the region, Archbishop

122. *CSH* 92, 624.

123. *CSH* 92, 624.

Hugh of Lyons, accused Otbert of "trying to draw into his body those whom Christ would redeem through his own body."[124] To the monks of Saint-Hubert, Pope Urban II called Otbert "a wolf . . . who has entered not by the mouth for your benefit but ascended from another place, so that he may consume, devour, and squander."[125] The denunciation conflates two images: the wicked pastor who acts as a wolf among his sheep and devours his flock; and a negative Host that enters the body in reverse, from the anus, annihilating rather than nourishing the recipient. Unwary congregants might receive mere bread and wine at Otbert's hands, but they would think it was the consecrated Host. The elements of his ceremony would thus be false signs, empty of meaning—and empty of Christ. They would convey death and not life to those who received the sacrament from the tainted bishop.

While wolf imagery on its own may be a stock reversal of the traditional image of bishop as shepherd, the evocation of a perverse Host conveys an even greater peril. The sacrament of communion was the model for all legitimate social and political bonds. According to eleventh- and twelfth-century sacramental orthodoxy, those who consumed the Host consumed Christ to their benefit and were in turn consumed in him: a process of mutual degustation and delight. In the image presented here, those who consume the sacraments of an unworthy priest do not receive the Lord's body but instead commit idolatry by accepting only the sacrament of a man: not God but mammon.

The theological term for this incomplete sacrament is *sacramentum tenus*. Depending on one's understanding of the sacraments it was used either for an invalid communion or for a properly consecrated Host that was received without a genuine love of peace.[126] With reference to the sacraments of the excommunicated Otbert we should accept the former usage. Because his sacraments were invalid, his congregants could not form a spiritual bond with God *through* the priest; the bond would be only with Otto.[127] As enshrined in the chronicle of Saint-Hubert, Urban's words transform the threat of an illicit prelate to the point where the obnoxious Otbert becomes a false Host:

---

124. *CSH* 71, 605.

125. *CSH* 92, 624.

126. For more on false peace and incomplete sacraments, see below, chapter 4.

127. It is tempting find here a distant echo of Carolingian ecclesiology, per Karl Morrison's suggestion that the priesthood "itself constituted the 'corpus Christi'" by virtue of the priest's role as ministrant; see K. F. Morrison, *The Two Kingdoms: Ecclesiology in Carolingian Political Thought* (Princeton, NJ, 1964), 37–38. The prospect of partial or imperfect sacramental efficacy must have been especially frightening.

he is violence incarnate, masquerading as a conveyer of peace. Like the Easter chrism of Milan, this false Host must be trampled, ground to dust, and discarded.

The internal consistency and social impact of the Gregorian reform cannot be understood without taking seriously the reformist concern with sacraments, a concern that had a deep, patristic history, in which certain forms of peace produced persecution as well as pollution. A sacrament was first and foremost a bond, not a ceremony. Eleventh-century clergymen worried constantly about the sacrament, how it worked, what it conveyed, and what constituted its violations. They endangered their lives both spiritually and on earth when they ventured into these speculations. Berengar of Tours was tried for heresy for his linguistic argument that bread and wine could not be completely annihilated in the Eucharist, Rupert of Deutz risked a heresy trial when he seemed to contradict Saint Augustine on whether Judas had taken communion at the Last Supper, and Guibert of Nogent seems to have realized that he lacked the skills to safely discuss the historicity of the Eucharist. In Rome, reformers Peter Damian and Humbert of Silva Candida sparred over the question of whether sacraments administered by sinners were objectively valid. The curia tried on several occasions to ban priests who continued to administer the sacraments while in a state of sin or excommunication. Popes forbade kings their sacraments and then anathematized anyone who continued to offer allegiance to excommunicated monarchs. Such adventures were not new, but in the late eleventh century, clergymen saw them as components of renovation before end times. They saw in sacramental violations the work of the devil now unchained and trying to ensnare others.

Gregorian polemic and policy framed insurrection as liberation from captivity. While liberation often came at a price in terms of human bloodshed, the pope and his advisers folded warfare into a program of substituting true peace for false. False peace was captivity, a pact with the devil that the canonist Rufinus of Sorrento would later call "the repose and somnolence of the Behemoth [who] sleeps under the shadow, in cover of the reed, in the moist places."[128] For Gregory, this somnolence had descended on the church ever since Roman emperors had begun to exert undue influence on clerical leadership and behavior. Imperial protection had simply masked the fact that the world was still persecuting the church.

128. *DBP* 1.8, 76: "Talis pax diaboli ad homines requies est et sompnus Behemot, quo *sub umbra dormit in secreto calami in locis humectibus*." Cf. Job 40.16.

A few years after the pope's exile, one of his fervent supporters, Bruno of Segni wrote that in order to form a *militia Christi*, as many bonds must be broken as made. After the birth of Christ, soldiers had broken their pact with demons to make a new one between themselves to glorify God.[129] Their "concord of the faith" (*fidei concordiam*) was a mutual pact to flee philosophy and heretical doctrine—a militant peace. In the wake of the Investiture Controversy, Bruno styled these Christian soldiers as clergymen, united in peace by a common enterprise against a common enemy. A mutually connected, apostolic community enjoyed the "peace of the saints," a condition restricted to men of "good will" and bestowing on them a single heart and soul.[130]

Crystallized in the crucible of the Pataria, the Gregorian notion of militant peacemaking matches our normative understanding of "violence." And the reformers received their fair share of it. Fellow clergymen beat up the bishop of Brescia who read to them Pope Nicholas II's reprimands regarding canonical election and apostolic authority.[131] The chronicler Bishop Bonizo also suffered, blinded and exiled by his congregation in Sutri. However, when opponents on either side actually deployed the term *violentia*, they referred not to this fighting but to deception, usurpation, or theft. In Milan, when the Pataria were refused the body of their martyr Ariald, Erlembald announced that violence would be necessary, by which he meant they must steal it away. Even then, he parsed the term carefully, as a matter of extreme necessity, conducted under strict guidelines of overt versus covert opposition, and most significantly, as an extension of the actions of others. The clergy of Milan had made the choice between acting freely (*gratis*) and action that was coerced (*violentia*). The term therefore does not refer to bloodshed, of which there had been much before this: there could be fighting with or without violence, and there could be violence with or without fighting.

Violence became the negation of peace only insofar as coercion of the spirit impeded true peace, authentic Christian community. For reformers the solution lay in an extension of sacramental action. The sacraments made invisible grace visible; warfare must do the same for invisible violence. Those who desired genuine peace must be prepared to deliver a salutary shock, to rupture the social order, even to maim and kill. God had arranged the

129. Bruno of Segni, *Sententiae* 2.7, PL 165:922D: "Et relicta idolorum cultura, Creatorem laudare, magnificare et glorificare coepit, illi soli eam gloriam exibendo, quam daemoniis prius exibere solebat."

130.. Bruno, *Sententiae* 2.7, 923A: "Illa *pax* sanctorum est; ista concordia illorum est, de quibus dicitur: 'Multitudinis autem credentium erat cor unum et anima una' [Acts 4.32]."

131. Bonizo, *Liber ad amicum* 6, 594.

economy of human salvation so that both good and wicked persons played a part. The makers of war served the purpose of revelation regardless of their intentions and morality.

Ultimately, such a solution offered little comfort to those with blood on their hands. Even if their fighting served God's purpose, killers could not be certain of their own salvation. In 1102, Sigebert of Gembloux rebuked the pope for sending armies against other Christians: "It is necessary that scandals come," he quoted Jerome, but this did not mean that those who scandalized were forgiven.[132] Pope Gregory VII had suggested a solution some years before: the evils of human beings arose from the faults of their leaders.[133] In 1130, Hugh of Saint-Victor described human culpability in a similar manner. Reason and carnality fought one another to gain control of the body. The body itself was "like a subject people," and hence blameless for the actions that it committed.[134] These images allowed the clergy to absolve the laity of bloodshed, effectively creating a "secular arm" to undertake military coercion. But could the clergy absolve themselves?

Abstention from weapons divorced churchmen only from direct worldly engagement; it did not prevent them from killing. Every excommunication conferred death everlasting, against which bodily death could not compare. When Sigebert warned the pope against binding in heaven those who should be free, he recalled Gregory the Great's warning that priests who damn unjustly commit murder.[135] One should not underestimate the anxiety of clerics unsure of their own ability to distinguish good leaders from wicked, and true community from false. If they made a mistake, they effectively killed their congregations.[136] While the education of most priests was rudimentary at best in late eleventh-century Europe, they grew up familiar with two great authorities, Saints Augustine and Gregory, who repeated God's warning in the book of Ezekiel: "[The wicked man] is indeed taken away in his sin but I will require his blood at the hand of the watchman" (Ezek. 33.6).[137]

---

132. Jerome, *Commentariorum in Matheum Libri IV* 3.18.7, ed. D. Hurst and M. Adriaen, CCSL 77:158. Sigebert, *EL* 3, 454.

133. Greg., *Reg.* 2.45, 183; Paul, *Vita Greg.* 39, 493–494.

134. Hugh of Saint-Victor, *De sacramentis Christianae fidae* 1.6.4, *PL* 176:266A.

135. Sigebert, *EL* 13, 464.

136. As Dyan Elliott has pointed out, churchmen concerned about potential mistaken condemnations could console themselves with the thought that the church triumphant (the higher justice of God) would underwrite any errors of the church militant. Elliott, *Proving Woman: Female Spirituality and Inquisitional Culture in the Later Middle Ages* (Princeton, NJ, 2004), 163–164.

137. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 1.9, ed. Bernhard Dombart and Alfons Kalb (Leipzig, 1928), 1:16–17, for example.

The intellectual and cultural production of the twelfth century, the great pastoral enterprise of the church, cannot be understood without acknowledging this drive toward the cultivation of discernment between good and wicked bonds. The clergy's fear of committing irreparable violence, and their desire to discover true peace, created new directives for scriptural exegesis, sacramental theology, and the great preaching missions to the new cities of western Europe. In the next few chapters, we will examine the impact of peacemaking desires on these theological and social programs of the high medieval church.

Chapter 4

Dueling Sacraments

The Communion of Judas Iscariot

Since the days of the Peace of God movement, a number of standard images served to describe those who rescinded peace. One, dogs returning to their vomit, alluded to Gregory the Great's criticism of apostates, indicating that taking up peace could be considered an act of conversion. A second image, the treachery of Judas Iscariot, shows how closely peace was associated with the sacraments. Repeatedly during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, churchmen discoursing on betrayed peace would refer to Judas. *The Deeds of the Bishops of Cambrai* compared those who broke their peace oaths to Judas, who had "handed over God."[1] Aelred of Rievaulx compared to Judas those who clung to false peace, because neither could benefit from the sacrament of reconciliation (penance).[2] Guibert of Nogent described as Judas Bishop Gaudry of Laon, who broke his pact to the Laon communion and provoked an insurrection.[3] In his account of a peace treaty

1. *Gesta episcoporum Cameracensium* 1.27, MGH SS 7:413.

2. Aelred of Rievaulx, *De speculo caritatis* 2.9.23, ed. A. Hoste and C. H. Talbot, CCCM 1:76.

3. See Guibert of Nogent, *Monodies* 3.1–3.9, in *Autobiographie*, ed. Edmond-René Labande (Paris, 1981), 268–356 (henceforth *Monodies*). Judas is both traitor and defaulting priest in the third book of Guibert's *Monodies*. He characterizes as Judas several politically ambitious bishops of Laon, claiming that their legacy of treachery ultimately led to the insurrection of the commune.

consecrated between King Henry IV and Pope Gregory VII at Canossa in 1077, Bonizo of Sutri compared the king to Judas, who was similarly damned because he took up Christ's body and blood with treachery in his heart at the Last Supper.

The Judas imagery brought together several related concerns about the peace of the church. Peace was a sacrament, held to be so in oaths of reconciliation (*sacramenta*), alliances, and of course in the Mass itself. It therefore had the potential for misuse, distortion, and falsification. A conspiracy constituted a false peace, as did any alliance that subverted divine will. Even simony was a rupture of peace, because it created a situation where false priests were offering their own domination instead of God's peace during Mass. Judas exemplified a purveyor of false peace, not only because he was a sinful priest but because he had traded God's body for money and had taken communion with him while holding treason in his heart. Debates over what Judas had taken at the Last Supper thus became a means of expressing clerical concerns about mirror sacraments and the falsification of peace on earth. In the process of resolving the question of Judas's communion, the early twelfth-century canon Alger of Liège created a theological framework for membership in the church, whereby the Eucharist distinguished between true and false peace.

Association between the sacraments and a false peace dated back to crises of ecclesiastical authority in late antique Rome and North Africa, when Cyprian of Carthage denounced rival bishops as purveyors of a false *pax*. Over a century later, when Augustine deplored the rigorist Donatists for their schismatic opinions, he asserted that their hatred of peace would prevent them from benefiting from the body of Christ. For eleventh-century churchmen, too, the basis of community was an affective pacification within the Mass. Their views on the relationship between church membership and the sacrament oscillated between those of Cyprian and Augustine. Many accepted Augustine's view that while anyone could physically consume the reality of the Lord's body, it was not possible to participate successfully in communion if one stood outside the church's peace.[4] However, similarly to Cyprian, many medieval Christians feared that the Eucharist itself might be falsified or negated, that the Host would revert to bread and wine in the presence of evil. In such a case, worshippers would receive not Christ's body but a diabolical parody that bound them to mammon.

4. Augustine, *De baptismo contra donatistas* 1.8.11 and 1.18.28, ed. M. Petschenig, CSEL 51:157 and 170–173.

Among the papal reformers, hard-liners like Humbert of Silva Candida built on Cyprian's suspicion of mirror sacraments, insisting that a sinful prelate invalidated the ceremony. Meanwhile Peter Damian, the sometime cardinal-bishop of Ostia and a confidant of popes from Leo IX to Alexander II, held to the more moderate stance that invocation of the Trinity, even by a sinner, was enough to ensure the due performance of the sacrament. As Leo IX's abortive attempt at invalidating the ordinations of sinful bishops had shown, the retroactive refutation of sacramental bonds would cause only chaos. Damian worried that any denial of validity would shake the faith of congregants, who could never be sure that what they received was Christ's body; the peace of whole communities would be shattered.[5]

Sacraments were sacred mysteries, but they could also be binding oaths, and like all oaths, their authenticity depended on the mental (i.e., emotional and spiritual) state of those confecting them. By the end of the eleventh century, following on Augustine, transformation of emotions and proper reception of the sacraments were seen to go hand in hand. In order to receive nourishment from Christ's body, one had to be able to sense it, to taste it, to suffer the pains of sacrifice, and to delight in the pleasures of divine mercy.[6] With the sacrament of peace, the principle was the same: the spiritual pleasure principle must take precedence over the carnal sensibilities. So, a sacrament did not fail; rather, the individual recipient's hatred of peace prevented him or her from divine grace.

All social and political contracts either partook of the sacramental epitome or parodied it. In the early twelfth century, the canon Hugh of Saint-Victor envisioned a conflict between the armies of Christ and the devil, each bearing their sacraments as insignia.[7] Members of the false church were the devil's army. As their sacraments, these sinners swore temporary and mercenary oaths that bound them to wicked men rather than to God. According to Hugh, the sacred mysteries united the forces of Christ, while nonsacramental oaths caused the devil and his minions to cleave together.[8] As churchmen pondered over the true and false peace offered by dueling sacraments, the debate over Judas's communion became a test case. If it had granted peace to a traitor, was the Last Supper still a valid sacrament? If it had failed to

5. For an overview of this debate, see U.-R. Blumenthal, *The Investiture Controversy: Church and Monarchy from the Ninth to the Twelfth Century* (Philadelphia, 1988), 74–76.

6. Alger, *De sacramentis corporis et sanguinis dominici* 1.3, PL 180:750A-750D, and 3.12, 847B.

7. Hugh of Saint-Victor, *De sacramentis Christianae fidei* 1.8.11, PL 176:312B-C.

8. Hugh, *De sacramentis Christianae fidae* 1.8.11, PL 176:312A-313C.

convey true peace, did that make the communion invalid? Pathways to the answers began with long-standing debates about the church and its peace. The sacramental stances of Cyprian and Augustine inform the two poles of the twelfth-century Judas debate and point toward the ecclesiological, social, and political implications of the fallen apostle's communion.

The Cyprianist Legacy of Dueling Sacraments

Carolingian limitations on monarchical overreach had relied on invocations of a sacramental unity; the vocabulary was there to be molded and deployed if papal reformers wanted it.[9] However, their characterization of the sacramental problems at the heart of the church went to the much earlier fears of Cyprian of Carthage. Dueling sacraments had haunted churchmen from the time of Cyprian and the imperial persecutions of the third century. As described previously, long a zone of entry, the ecclesiastical sacraments now also became a site for authentication of the spirit; the impact of apostasy, schism, and corruption registered most vividly in the conduct of penance and in jealousies over the Eucharist.[10]

By controlling access to the sacraments, Cyprian was trying to forestall a diabolical antichurch, one that gave lay confessors the same authority as bishops. Whether through accident or apostasy, those who took communion in a different church exchanged one form of peace for another, and this made them physically incapable of consuming the true Body and Blood. Cyprian cites instances of babies who once given a polluted sacrament would later have to vomit the Host.[11] Confronted with the true sacrament, people who had "eaten the devil's dinner" would undergo horrific fits, vomiting and writhing as the wafer turned to ashes in their hands and wine curdled inside them.[12] Cyprian warned his flock: "They think it is peace that some sell with lying words. That is not peace but war."[13]

For Cyprian, the most pertinent foe was not the pagan world or its extension, the Roman state, but rather the monster that Roman violence had raised

9. See Karl Morrison, *The Two Kingdoms: Ecclesiology in Carolingian Political Thought* (Princeton, NJ, 1964), 37–41.

10. See above, chapter 3.

11. Cyprian, *De lapsis* 25, ed. M. Bévenot, CCSL 3:234–235.

12. *De lapsis* 26, 235 and 35, 240: "Post diaboli cibum malle ieiunium."

13. *De lapsis* 16, 229–230: "Pacem putant esse quam quidam verbis fallacibus vendidant: non est *pax* illa sed bellum."

up within the community of Christians: mirror churches of the rigorous and the lapsed that offered empty sacraments and destruction in the guise of *pax*. The more radical eleventh-century reformers invoked Cyprian's fear of dueling sacraments when it became clear to them that they still needed to combat imperial persecution. To them, false sacraments presupposed the illicit church rule of antibishops, disobedient princes of the church who had offered oaths of fidelity to the errant emperor rather than to the pope.

Between 1050 and 1118, church reformers vigorously debated the validity of sacraments performed by sinners. Initiated by Humbert of Silva Candida and nuanced by Peter Damian, the question then passed to luminaries like Guitmund of Aversa, Rupert of Deutz, and Alger of Liège.[14] At issue was whether the presence of a sinner so polluted the ceremony as to invalidate it. Damian and Guitmund argued that it did not, since the invocation of the divine name was itself enough to ensure the transmission of grace. In this they represented the Augustinian understanding of sacraments, as sacred signs or grace made manifest.[15] While the Augustinian position eventually prevailed from a theological standpoint, among everyday clergymen, radical reformers, and bewildered congregations, Cyprianist suspicions of sacramental integrity persisted. They emerge in polemical fashion in discussions of Judas's communion, and in an episode that some might consider its eleventh-century concordance: the false peace between Henry IV and Gregory VII at Canossa in 1077.

False Peace at Canossa

In 1077, Pope Gregory was crossing the Apennines on his way to Augsburg, where he intended to convene a council of German princes that would replace the excommunicated King Henry. Henry meanwhile was making his way south, to forestall Gregory. The king's army camped outside the fortress of Canossa, where Gregory had lodged with his ally Mathilda of Tuscany. The meeting of pope and king at Canossa may be the most famous incident

14. For an in-depth study of the debate between Rupert and Alger, see Guntram Bischoff, "The Eucharistic Controversy between Rupert of Deutz and His Anonymous Adversary: Studies in the Theology and Chronology of Rupert of Deutz (c. 1076–c. 1129) and His Earlier Literary Work" (PhD diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1965); and J. H. Van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz* (Berkeley, 1983), 58–67.

15. In response to the Donatists, who wished to nullify the baptism of apostates, Augustine had argued that what enabled individuals to live from the sacraments was their love of the church's peace; see below. Augustine, *De baptismo* 1.8.11, 157; 1.18.28, 170–173.

of the Investiture contest, its memory preserved on the papal side by Bernold of Constance, Berthold of Reichenau, and Bonizo of Sutri. Lacking options, Gregory eventually made peace with the king, but not before Henry had appeared before the pope as a penitent, barefoot in the snow.[16] Henry accepted three conditions that the pope laid out: the papacy had the power to excommunicate the king; it had the power to rescind excommunication; and Gregory was the rightful pope. According to Bonizo of Sutri, the two sealed the pact "through the mediation of the Lord's sacrament," a Mass in which a humbled Henry shared the table with assembled clergy and laymen, including the pope.[17]

Despite the abjectness of the appearance Henry presented at Canossa, one might agree with the author of the *Vita Henrici* (1106) and Gregory's disappointed Saxon supporters that the king had actually won the exchange.[18] As an act of concern for the elderly pope, Henry insisted on escorting Gregory to his desired destination. The pope could not refuse so soon after reconciliation, but it also meant that his presence at Augsburg would be a farce, protected as he was by the very ruler he was trying to supplant. Gregory had to content himself with sending legates; the new anti-king Rudolf of Rheinfelden did not receive full support when he was elected a little later at a council in Forscheim. By 1084 Henry had not only broken the truce but declared war on Rome and driven the pope into exile.[19]

In the years that followed Gregory's exile, those who wished to restore the memory of their vanquished and reviled pope began to transform the failed peace of Canossa into a papal victory. To that end, the image of Henry in the snow had great currency and has become the dominant memory of the meeting. Ute-Renate Blumenthal argues that in the process of submission,

16. Berthold of Reichenau, *Annales*, ed. G. H. Pertz, MGH SS 5:288–290; and Bernold of Constance, *Chronicon*, ed. G. H. Pertz, MGH SS 5:433–434.

17. Bonizo of Sutri, *Liber ad amicum* 8, ed. Ernst Dümmler, MGH LDL 1:610.

18. I. S. Robinson, *Henry IV of Germany, 1056–1106* (Cambridge, 1999), 167; *Vita Heinrici IV imperatoris* 3, ed. W. Eberhard, MGH SSrGs 58:16; Bruno of Merseburg, *Saxonicum bellum* 108, ed. Hans-Eberhard Lohmann, MGH Deutsches Mittelalters 2 (Leipzig, 1937), 97–99; Harald Zimmermann, *Der Canossagang von 1077: Wirkungen und Wirklichkeit* (Mainz, 1975), on the enduring historiography of Canossa, which gained more traction in modern than premodern Germany, and for an assessment of who "won" the peace.

19. Blumenthal, *Investiture "Controversy,"* 123–125.

Henry ultimately relinquished the sacrality of Ottonian-Salian kingship.[20] Bonizo went even further than his fellow chroniclers, denying Henry not only sacrality but also the prospect of salvation. In his hands Canossa became a Passion play, with the king playing the part of Judas. Like Judas at the Last Supper, Henry had let Satan enter him.[21] He did so, Bonizo argued, by eating the morsel of sacramental bread and wine without true belief, without genuinely accepting the conditions of peace.

According to Bonizo, Henry dissimulated, presenting both superficial devotion and a seeming detachment from the illicit friendships that had earned him papal ire. He arrived at the meeting with harmful intentions but, clad in "the innocence of a dove," first stood barefoot in snow and ice, humbling himself and deceiving everyone else. When the pope gave Henry absolution by means of the sacrament, the king ignored his excommunicated bishops by day yet sought their "pestilential" counsels by night, as well as the advice of a man named Censius, who had long been a troublemaker for the papacy.[22] This image of nocturnal pollution through false counsel completed the indictment of Henry's alleged insincerity. While giving every sign of an authentic conversion, Henry remained unrepentant and unreformed.

By comparing Henry's communion to the supper of Judas, Bonizo demonstrated how a sacrament would ultimately expose the twin poles of goodness and wickedness, even when both looked the same. Pope Gregory remained the only person that Henry could not deceive. Like Jesus, the pope knew that the man to whom he offered communion was a traitor; he included Henry within the body of the Lord in order to make him betray himself out of his own mouth. The king immediately lapsed from his oath of

20. Ibid., 124. Blumenthal has also pointed to the brief *De penitentia regis Salomonis* as evidence that as early as 1077, Henry's sympathizers were at work to minimize the most damaging effects of their king's prostration, by comparing his penance to that of the wise King Solomon. Blumenthal, "Canossa and Royal Ideology in 1077: Two Unknown Manuscripts of *De penitentia regis Salomonis*," *Manuscripta* 22 (1978): 91–96; repr. by Variorum (Aldershot, UK, 1998). H. E. J. Cowdrey, *Pope Gregory VII, 1073–1085* (Oxford, 1998), 165–167, however, argues that a matured Henry began to "re-invest" the Salian kingship with its sacral character in the aftermath of Canossa and its immediate political and personal humiliations.

21. Bonizo, *Ad amicum* 8, 610.

22. Bonizo identifies him only as "Deo odibilis Cencius," but this Cencius was most likely the noble who briefly kidnapped the pope, an episode described in Paul of Bernried's *vita* of Gregory. Speaking of the same incident, Arnulf of Milan describes Censius as a "violent" usurper and compares him to Judas, who betrayed his Lord in the night. Arnulf, *Liber gestorum* 6, 224.

peace, thus denying himself the salvation of the sacrament.[23] The sacramental peace of Canossa therefore tested Henry's genuine and willing integration in the spiritual church, present and future.

Proper acceptance of the Host—at the level of spirit as well as flesh—was conflated with the sincerity of Henry's overtures of peace. By styling the political rupture as a failed communion, Henry's opponents had returned the king's treachery to the initial concerns of church reform, the purity of the sacraments. It did not matter that many a ruler had previously broken pacts. Not just an oath of peace but Christ's entire body had been rejected through Henry's treachery.

Though intended to bolster the memory of Gregory, Bonizo's explanation of the communion at Canossa therefore generated some troubling questions. Had Henry's participation polluted the papal Mass as a whole, or was it only the king who had received an empty sacrament? If an unworthy ministrant could defile communion, as Gregory's supporters had alleged in their critiques of simoniac bishops, then surely the presence of a dissembling king would pollute the ceremony as well. But then had Gregory also taken up a false sacrament, and that too with complete knowledge? Writing ten years before Bonizo, Lampert of Herzfeld and Berthold had managed to avoid this problem. They never mentioned that the king ever *took* communion.[24] Nevertheless, Bonizo's account suggested that it was hard to unmask sinners without first inviting them to share the communion table.

Unwittingly, the bishop of Sutri had stumbled on what would be one of the driving quandaries of church reform in the twelfth century. The communion of a Judas figure (in this case Henry) encapsulated the danger that, in trying to engage and transform the world, members of the spiritual church would themselves be transformed, stained by ties of love to unworthy persons. The communion table provided a powerful site of moral proof, but would the judgment of Christ's body not also descend on those earnest men who took communion with the unknown wicked? For this reason, in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries, important debates about the Real Presence in the sacrament focused on the response of the Host to evil. The historical instance of Judas at the Last Supper became the central issue in this discussion.

By the end of the eleventh century, with the highest authorities diametrically opposed to one another, and even educated churchmen seemingly

23. Bonizo, *Ad amicum* 8, 610–611.

24. Note 16, above; Cowdrey, *Gregory VII*, 158n; and I. S. Robinson, *The Papal Reform of the Eleventh Century: Lives of Pope Leo IX and Pope Gregory VII* (Manchester, 2004), 241n.

unable to distinguish just authority from injustice, Christians confronted two churches: one held together by bonds of true peace, and the other captivated by false. Since these churches were mirror images of one another, it was almost impossible to tell them apart. In each, prelates performed sacraments, and worshippers came together. But only in one church were members incorporated through bonds of peace (*vincula pacis*) in the body of Christ. In the other, according to Hugh of Saint-Victor, they cleaved together like scales, an image of insensible, diabolical association that Bernard of Clairvaux would hurl at heretics and Stephan of Tournai at communes.[25] Hugh envisioned a conflict between the armies of Christ and the devil, each bearing their sacraments as insignia.

To use Cyprianist language, war was being offered in place of *pax*. At Liège, where papal-imperial rivalries played out on a local scale, the unpopular bishop Otbert's opponents used a vocabulary of violence to excoriate him, and by doing so they raised fears of a reverse sacrament that ascended rather than descended within the body of recipients, laying waste to their souls as it captivated them in a concord of the damned. Not surprisingly, descriptions of Henry's own conduct also rang with images of false peace and illicit sacraments. Fears regarding sacramental validity and false peace converged around Canossa. They produced a series of debates over whether a sinner's presence could pollute or negate the Real Presence. Judas's communion came under special scrutiny because he epitomized both an unworthy recipient and a sinful priest.

In their efforts to resolve the question of whether Judas did in fact take up the Real Presence, early twelfth-century theologians Rupert of Deutz and Alger of Liège explored the role of peace in the reception of the sacrament and the formation of ecclesial community. Their descriptions speak to the principles underlying the formation of bonds of peace and fetters of violence. The greatest threat posed by violence was when it looked identical to true peace. Wicked communities held together by illicit oaths and hatred of others might never actively expose the violence that lurked within. Tranquility therefore was no guide to the validity of community formation; only the true peace of communion must serve. The emotional and sensory transformations of the Eucharist thus became the yardstick, not only of an authentic sacrament but also of appropriate friendship and intersubjective bonds. Be they conversion, insurrection, or confraternity, all attempts at true peace were an extension of the Mass.

---

25. See chapter 7 below.

The Ambiguous Communion of Judas Iscariot

On the evening of Passover, the night Jesus was arrested, master and disciples partook of a last supper. During the meal, Jesus announced: "He that dips his hand with me in the dish shall betray me" (Matt. 26.23) According to the Gospel of Matthew, at that moment Judas asked: "Is it I, Rabbi?"; and Jesus answered: "You have said it" (26.25). The Master then blessed the bread, broke it, and said to his disciples: "Take and eat. This is my body" (26.26). He took up the chalice, gave thanks, and passed it around with the words, "All of you drink from this, for this is my blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many unto the remission of sins" (26.27). Jesus then foretold that this would be his final Passover on earth, and after the assembly had sung its closing hymns, he led his disciples to the Mount of Olives.

The Gospel of Mark describes the scene in much the same way as Matthew, without singling out Judas's guilt-ridden question to his master. In Luke, Jesus first announced his impending death, then blessed and circulated bread and wine, and finally remarked that one among the assembled would betray him (22.16–22). The rest of the meal he spent haranguing Simon Peter on his forthcoming denial of his master. More than the other gospels, Luke focuses on issues of future leadership among the apostles, with the suggestion that Peter's claim is weaker than those of the others; Judas is largely ignored.

In the synoptic Gospels, therefore, despite the detailed description of the Last Supper, the question of Judas's eating features little. Each of the authors prefaces the story of the Supper with an account of Judas meeting the Pharisees to conspire against his master. But these accounts do not follow Judas at the supper table, and they fail to clarify whether or not Judas actually partook of Christ's body and blood with the disciples. In the twelfth century, some churchmen would point to Matthew and suggest that after Judas betrayed himself he must have left the assembly, before Jesus spoke the blessing. If he partook of the same dish as Jesus, he must have simply eaten a morsel (*bucella*) of bread, tinged, as was the custom, with wine. However, by their reticence on the subject, the gospels seemed to deny this convenient scenario.

For Christians, the Last Supper prefigured and provided the pattern for the sacrament of communion. Thus the ambiguity of Judas's participation at the Supper left unanswered questions for a medieval church in which sacramental integrity and authentic membership had become looming and related concerns. Judas was clearly a traitor by the time he came to the Supper; his expulsion before the sacrament would confirm the ceremony as one

in which peace and unity were established through the prior removal of offenders.[26] Described by Augustine as an apostle who turned away from Christ but did not immediately depart from his presence, Judas is the target of Jesus's enigmatic words, "Have I not elected the twelve of you, even though one among you is the devil?"[27] Even if he had been given the task of ministry in Galilee, by Hildebrandine logic his subsequent actions would have negated his priestly authority, especially since, as Luke also says, "Satan entered him." (22.3) Had he been condemned and expelled before the breaking of bread, or had he been allowed to remain despite Jesus's knowledge that the man with whom he broke bread had no peace in his heart? Since Jesus had already said, "This is my body and blood," surely what the other apostles received, Judas had received too.

If Judas had remained at the table (as seemed most likely) but received something other than Christ's body and blood, then readers of the gospels faced two impossibilities: that Jesus was lying, or that the body of the omnipotent God was forced by human wickedness to revert to bread. If, on the other hand, Judas *had* received the Lord's body, and thus shared in the community's peace, did that mean that he was among the saved, that he could convey peace to others? Did a man who would trade God for thirty pieces of silver possess the same spiritual faculties as his fellow apostles when they had entered house after house, saying: "Peace be with you"? (Matt. 10.13). Models for the reform church of the eleventh and twelfth centuries depended on the answers to these questions. When it came to the composition, unity, and purity of the church, there were lessons to be learned from the specter of Judas at the feast.

The Judas Debate Begins

For a man condemned to everlasting death, Judas has enjoyed a long and interesting afterlife. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries, Judas's betrayal allowed clerics to explore corruption in church leadership, the composition of an apostolic community, and the limits of the evangelical enterprise. Judas exemplified not only a traitor but also a leader who had mobilized military power, that of imperial Rome, against the *ecclesia*, bringing political violence

26. In the sixteenth century, the Swiss Anabaptists followed this example by their establishment of the ban *before* the Supper.

27. Augustine, *In Iohannis evangelium tractates* 27.10, ed. Augustine Mayer and R. Willems, CCSL 36:274 (henceforth *Tr. in J.*).

into a spiritual community. While Bonizo associated Henry IV with Judas, Rupert of Deutz used the same imagery against Henry's ally Bishop Otbert of Liège. In 1115, his contemporary Guibert of Nogent characterized as Judas several politically ambitious bishops of Laon, whose legacy of treachery had led to the insurrection of the Laon commune.[28] These were not unconsidered insults but rather allusions to failed leadership, both treacherous and concupiscent. The debate over Judas's communion thus became an attempt to resolve the contrast between a politically entangled church and its communal, apostolic ideal.

Even if the memory of Canossa did not start the debate about Judas, it certainly ensured a pattern for the questions and established high stakes for the answers. It may not be coincidence, then, that one of the first theologians to bring up the question of Judas's communion, Guitmund of Aversa, had accompanied Gregory's legates to the eventual deposition of King Henry IV at the assembly of Forscheim (1077).[29] As a bishop, Guitmund had also had to contend with opposition from his own diocesan clergy and relied on the goodwill of Pope Urban II for the validity of his election.[30] He was no stranger to the dangers posed to a rector's authority by the disavowal of sacramental efficacy. Guitmund insisted on the validity of Judas's communion at exactly the same time as Bonizo was denouncing the manner in which Henry had received his.

Guitmund raised the Judas question in a treatise against the Eucharistic heresy of Berengar of Tours. Directed by Archdeacon Hildebrand, the papal curia had forced Berengar to burn most of his offending writings, so what we know of them comes from his opponents Guitmund and Lanfranc of Bec. Berengar used linguistic rules to argue that Jesus's words "This is my body" negated the possibility that bread and wine were completely annihilated in the process of Eucharistic transformation. "This" as a subject persisted in the predicate thanks to the identity created by the verb "to be." Well in advance of the dialectical arguments of scholastics like Peter Abelard,

---

28. See Guibert of Nogent, *Monodies* 3.1–3.9, 268–356. Judas is both traitor and defaulting priest in the third book of Guibert of Nogent's *Monodies*. More than one treacherous bishop is thus declaimed. Given the contemporaneous debate on his communion, the Judas appellation is not an easily dismissed commonplace, especially as it concerns ordained priests and leaders of the church.

29. Paul of Bernried calls him "Christian" rather than Guitmund. Paul of Bernried, *Vita Gregorii papae*, ed. J. M. Watterich (Leipzig, 1862), 527.

30. See Jaffé 5357 and 5358; also Urban's more onerous demands on Guitmund in Jaffé 5362 and 5363, collected in *Pope Urban II, The Collectio Britannica, and the Council of Melfi (1089)*, ed. Robert Sommerville and Stephan Kuttner (Oxford, 1996), 53–58, and 63–71.

Berengar contended that the Lord would not break his own rules of language. Contrary to the doctrine popularized by the Carolingian Radbert and espoused by the papacy, Berengar maintained that the Host retained elements of bread and wine. Guitmund championed Radbertian orthodoxy by distinguishing between the form and substance of the sacrament, only the former of which stayed the same. He was able to maintain the Radbertian notion of a Real Presence along lines that were philosophically compelling as well as orthodox.[31]

However, while closing one chapter of the Eucharistic debate, Guitmund opened another. Toward the end of his treatise, he discussed the communion of unworthy persons. Was it possible, he asked, for an evil man, even Judas, to change the Lord's substance or to corrupt it in any way? Guitmund insisted that an individual recipient's morality did not affect the transformation itself. The impact of impurities could not be on the body of the Lord, since it was incorruptible. Instead worthiness and unworthiness affected the *act* of eating. Eating could be spiritual or corporeal. Spiritual eating followed certain mores and was characterized by *caritas* or love. Guitmund quotes Augustine: "Not by eating something bad but by eating it badly" do we receive eternal demise.[32] As an example of this, the Lord had given Christians the example of Judas who ate Christ's true body unto damnation.

Guitmund used the paradox of Judas's inclusion to argue that participation of the wicked was not an impediment to the communion of good persons. If there was any indignity done to the body of the Lord, it was in the assumption that human flaws could taint it.[33] The fact that communion was a collective rite (as opposed to confession) should show that the Real,

31. Guitmund used the phrase *substantialiter transmutari* to explain the change from bread and wine into Christ's flesh and blood. This phrase was part of the official oath of 1059 by which Berengar had had to recant his opinions on the Eucharist. A. J. MacDonald, *Berengar and the Reform of Sacramental Doctrine* (New York, 1930), 341–344.

32. Guitmund of Aversa, *La "Verita" dell'Eucaristia: De corporis et sanguinis Christi veritate*, ed. and trans. Luciano Orabona (Naples, 1995), 1493A (henceforth *De veritate*): "Just like Judas, to whom the Lord handed a morsel (*bucellam*), allowed the devil a place inside him, not by accepting something bad but by accepting it badly; so every person unworthily taking up the Lord does not cause the sacrament to be bad because he himself is bad, or accept nothing because he has not accepted benefit. Indeed the body of the Lord and the blood of the Lord was made no less (*nihilominus erat*) by those of whom the Apostle said: 'He who eats and drinks unworthily eats and drinks a judgment upon himself.'"

33. *De veritate*, 1494B: "Indeed the flesh and blood of the Lord is incorruptible. Additionally what is incorruptible is neither corrupted nor able to be corrupted. Yet to squander His essence and through corruption to be reverted to corruptible bread and wine, that is certainly a great corruption."

substantial Presence could not depend on an individual participant's worthiness. In the temporal realm, people were constrained but also united by their inability to know the worthiness of others or even themselves. If the divine Presence depended on *human* worthiness, recipients would be lying every time they affirmed with conviction that this was the Lord's body, since no one could confirm that there was anyone present who was truly worthy of it.[34] This image of an untainted communion spoke directly to broader questions of membership in the church, ones that would be taken up in the first years of the twelfth century by two intellectuals in the diocese of Liège.

The Judas Debate in Liège

Guitmund may have convinced himself regarding the communion of Judas, but the concerns he had voiced gave rise to a broader debate, one that sucked in embittered monks and defensive canons. The bishop Otbert of Liège, already condemned as a false sacrament and violent bishop by no less than Pope Urban himself, provided his opponents with one of the easiest targets. Only a few years after his supposed "invasion" of Saint-Hubert of Amdain, Otbert expelled the abbot of Saint-Laurence of Liège and faced the wrath of the Laurentian monk Rupert of Deutz. Rupert elaborated on the image of a violent Liègeois bishop defiling the divine sacrament by comparing him to an archetypal pollutant: Judas Iscariot, the treasonous apostle.

As papal-imperial hostilities intensified at the end of the eleventh century, borderlands became embroiled both politically and intellectually. Excommunicated by Pope Gregory in 1076, King Henry was a Judas figure to his enemies, a leader placed outside the embrace of the church. Those who kept Henry's company were also excommunicated, among them Otbert, who remained bishop of Liège from ca. 1092 to 1119. Close to the bases of Henry (who died in the city in 1104), Liègeois intellectuals were locally invested in debates over the communion of sinners and simoniacs. Otbert owed his appointment to Henry, allegedly through simony, and maintained

34. *De veritate*, 1493B: "Indeed what if no unworthy person receives the body of the Lord, and in that circumstance, the portion of bread seems to remain unchanged on account of unworthy persons? Yet no worthy person may dare to speak, whence is written: Man does not know whether in his life he is worthy of love or hatred, but nor should he dare judge regarding another. Indeed it is written: Do not praise a man in this life; indeed a man sees in external form, God sees even into the heart; at any rate, (*utique*) no one will confidently venture to acknowledge that the body is of the Lord. . . . If no one dares to confidently acknowledge this, the priest can therefore hardly confirm, this is the body of Christ; the populace cannot say Amen, this is, it truly is. . . . But this cannot be, because by that logic the religious confessions of the whole church would be reprehensible."

his allegiance until the king's death. By the association of their mutual bonds, Otbert too was Judas. Liège therefore suffered on multiple fronts, as the papacy supported litigation against the bishop, and Pope Paschal II even sent Robert of Flanders to attack the diocese. Prolific intellectuals within the diocese also brought the unpopular Otbert into their broader ruminations on church community and leadership.

If his friendship with Henry were not enough to alienate him from the papacy and its supporters, Otbert's abrasive policy of monastic reorganization sealed the bishop's fate. When Otbert dismissed Abbot Theodore of Saint-Laurence, Rupert of Deutz refused to receive his priestly orders from the bishop. He hinted why by arguing subsequently that Judas the false apostle had received only a morsel (*bucella*) of bread tinged with wine at the Lord's hands, and that this piece of history was a moral lesson for the present, when unworthy priests in the church of Liège were preventing the Lord from manifesting in the sacrament.

The Judas debate was part of a wider scholarly upheaval in northern European intellectual circles between 1111 and 1117, a clash in pastoral outlook and scriptural interpretation between the new secular schools and exegetes in the older monastic tradition. Rupert can be found at the heart of many of these controversies, often in attacks against secular intellectuals like Anselm of Laon. In the 1120s, when Anselm of Havelberg defended the canonial profession against monastic accusations of worldliness, he derided a "pot-bellied monk" who was most likely Rupert. But few wanted to enter a debate with Rupert on the communion. Even though the heresy trial of Berengar was fifty years old, Eucharistic change remained a dangerous subject, fraught with the potential for important if unintentional doctrinal errors.[35]

Rupert's stiffest opposition came from within Otbert's circle: the bishop's secretary, Alger of Liège. Like his fellow canons Anselm of Laon and Hugh of Saint-Victor, Alger was a product of secular schooling, and like them, he maintained a critical distance, if not neutrality, from the polemical excesses of the Investiture Controversy. While he may have felt the need to defend his bishop, he was also concerned that no mistakes be made regarding the nature of the Lord's mercy as communicated through the sacrament, since

35. Jay Rubenstein, *Guibert of Nogent: Portrait of a Medieval Mind* (New York, 2002), 132–172, describes vividly Guibert's struggles with questions around the Eucharist, particularly the question on the nature of the morsel (*bucella*) that Judas ate. Guibert's moral, historical, and idiosyncratic approaches to the question could not satisfy a scholastic, post-Berengarian audience, avid for the mechanics of the sacramental miracle.

membership in the church was ultimately expressed through the peace of communion. Alger warned against too rigid an exclusion of members, noting that for the sake of doing justice (*iustitia*), the church should not forgo mercy (*misericordia*).[36] Around 1110, Alger wrote the *Liber de misericordia et iustitia*, a work that showed the irenic influence of Peter Damian's *Liber gratissimus*, in which the hermit of Fonte Avellana had argued that within the church, grace flowed through all sacraments, regardless of the moral qualities of the recipients. Alger insisted that as long as they were properly administered, all sacraments retained their validity, even when offered outside the church.[37]

In 1111, Rupert wrote *De divinis officiis*, which one scholar suggests was a response to Alger's inclusive ecclesiology.[38] Rupert not only disagreed with the objective validity of the sacraments but also insisted that Judas had not taken the Lord's body, and that this must be regarded as a historical precedent for denying the validity of a sinner's communion. The supper, at which Jesus had called out cowards and traitors, was the occasion for the demarcation of community, and Judas the precedent for those whose exclusion underwrote the peace of the sacrament. In his early treatise, Rupert suggested that the presence of a sinner had driven the life out of the Eucharist, and therefore Judas had received only bread.[39] Between 1111 and 1117, Rupert seems to have been revising this argument in response to Alger's *De sacramentis*, which was specifically about communion.[40] In 1117, Rupert

36. Bischoff, "Controversy," 35: "Nothing could verify . . . [the moderation of Alger] better than . . . [*Liber de misericordia et iustitia*] and its method of reasonable mediation between the combatants of his day, and the harmonization of patristic texts. Nothing, it seems, could upset Alger's equanimity but the unreasonable, radical, and narrow-minded position of some stiff-necked Gregorian reformers."

37. The sacraments of simoniacs (but not of heretics) were valid according to Damian. Alger considered simoniacs to *be* heretics and denied them the grace of the sacraments but not the ability to administer them. Nicholas Häring, "A Study in the Sacramentology of Alger of Liége," *Medieval Studies* 20 (1958): 42–43 (henceforth "Sacramentology"). Alger's criterion of performance at this point was the correct invocation (Trinitarian) of the divine name. Häring notes that this is an expansion of Damian's argument regarding the validity of baptism, even though Alger does not admit as much.

38. Bischoff, "Controversy," 169.

39. See Rubenstein, *Guibert of Nogent*, 156–157.

40. See Bischoff's speculative chronology of the tracts in "Controversy," 41, 118, and 168–169. Alger's work is hard to date. Some of Alger's specific comments debunking objectionable Eucharistic theology seem to be direct responses to Rupert's second treatment of Judas's communion in *Commentaria in evangelium sancti Iohannis*. This suggests, contrary to Bischoff's opinion, that *De sacramentis corporis et sanguinis dominici* may have been written after the *Commentaria*.

wrote *Commentaria in evangelium sancti Iohannis*, in which he repeated his general strictures against the communion of sinners but admitted it was untenable that the bread could lose its divine nature after consecration. Instead, he now insisted that the gospels never actually depicted Judas himself taking anything explicitly called the Lord's body. Judas had departed from the community before the sacraments were instituted.[41] Furthermore, humanity received benefit from the sacraments *only through the historical events of Christ's passion*.[42] Thus, from both a historical and a doctrinal viewpoint, Judas had not taken communion and had never performed or participated in any church sacraments, an example that should be extended to all simoniacal and sinful bishops.

Such theological and historical gymnastics were not simply the product of stubbornness but evidence of a burning desire to ensure that membership of the church be strictly delimited. Rupert's position was not unreasonable if, reading Matthew 25.23 closely, the traitor had eaten from the dish *at the same time* as Jesus, and thus *before* he had blessed the bread. But the monk was taking huge risks with his argument, and contradicted a number of patristic authors, such as Leo the Great and most directly Augustine. He was even summoned to a trial at Liège in 1117.[43] It was only through a last-minute discovery of similar opinions expressed by a church father, Hilary of Poitiers, that Rupert was able to escape sanctions on his future output.[44] Unlike the Berengarian controversy, this debate over Judas's communion was not a struggle between dialectical innovation and orthodoxy.[45] At issue was a historical precedent that provided a lesson about unity, purity, and benefit within the community of the church.

---

41. Rupert of Deutz, *Commentaria in evangelium sancti Iohannis*, ed. R. Haacke, CCCM 9:382 (henceforth *Comm. in ev. I*). (In this text, Rupert's chapters follow the gospel's, so I will not list them.) On Rupert's change of position between the two treatises, see Rubenstein, *Guibert of Nogent*, 156–157; and Bischoff, "Controversy," 84 and 110.

42. Rupert, *Comm. in ev. I.*, 381.

43. In a letter to Bishop Cuno of Siegburg, Rupert claimed that his contradiction of Augustine had been the most important factor in his being called to trial. Rupert, *In regulam S. Benedicti* 2, PL 170:496B: "At illi me ex hoc diffamare coeperunt, tanquam haereticum, qui dixissem non esse in canone Augustinum"; and Bischoff, ""Controversy,"" 14–15, where parts of the letter are translated.

44. Rupert, *In regulam* 2, 495D-496A and 496B: "Nosti ubi, quando vel quomodo tibiis, de quo jam dixi, occurrerit beatus Hilarius, taliterque me defenderit, ut sine illo non possem judicari haereticus" (i.e., without Saint Hilary's consent, Rupert could not be judged a heretic).

45. B. Stock, *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Princeton, NJ, 1983), 273, characterizes the Berengarian controversy in this manner.

Theological Positions on Communion and Community

Rupert of Deutz was a monk, and as such his notions of community bear the marks of one whose daily round featured cloister, altar, and a select and fairly stable group of brothers.[46] The members of this community carried a great deal of responsibility for the disciplining and judgment of their fellows. The demands of general church membership could be no less rigorous, and the work of admitting or rejecting members ultimately rested with a community that worked hard to ensure its internal purity. Rupert thus imagined church membership through the historical and moral precedent of the Last Supper. For him, Judas's inclusion did not constitute an injunction for the community to tolerate the irredeemably wicked, as some, including Augustine, had argued. At the supper, Judas had been revealed as a devil, fallen, through his pride, to a depth of hell commensurate with his previously exalted position.[47] The nature of his sin excluded him from New Testament lessons about the toleration of wickedness in the church. Even if every church had its share of unworthy leaders, there was no historical precedent for the inclusion of treacherous prelates, simoniacs, or schismatics in the sacrament of communion.[48] While allowing that the sacrament administered by a heretical priest might be objectively valid, there was no reason that it *should* actually be administered.[49] Nor, conversely, should an

46. See Van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz*, 365–368.

47. Rupert, *Comm. in ev. I.*, 379–380: "Indeed in here the evangelist rightly wishing to confirm him to be named a devil adds suitable reason, saying: 'Here indeed was one who would sell him, even though he might be one of the twelve.' 'Devil' is a Greek name, not referring to nature but to bad qualities (*accidentis*) and is interpreted as 'downward flowing.' By which name one rightly calls that damned lost angel . . . and indeed Judas flowed down in the same way [from a high place, through pride to the depths of the inferno. For] who does not know the apostolic grade to be higher than all the collected orders of saints?"

48. *Comm. in ev. I.*, 381: "Sed rursus eiusdem praeceptum est, ut sanctum canibus non debemus, et qui correptionem non recipit, sit nobis sicut ethnicus et publicanus. Ipse autem Judam, non qualemcunque canem, non qualemcunque ethnico similem, sed diabolum esse noverat." Cf. Matt. 18.17: "But if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man (*ethnicus*) and a publican."

49. Bischoff, "Controversy," 82, suggests that any doubts that Rupert may have had over the objective validity of the heretical sacraments must have been resolved in his alleged oral debate with Alger. By the time that the two were writing in opposition to one another, Rupert held that the objective validity of the sacrament was separate from the issue of whether it should be performed. Rupert showed little interest in the principles of sacramental transformation or objective validity, preferring to concentrate on the indignity of allowing a sinner to conjoin with the Godhead.

unworthy person consume the sacrament, even if this consumption did not negate its validity.[50]

Rupert's insistence on the exclusion of sinners stemmed from a conviction that while the events of the Passion had imbued the church with sacramental authority, human salvation hinged on the Incarnation. When the Word became flesh, human and divine natures conjoined, a "convisceration," as Guntram Bischoff emphasizes.[51] The Eucharist, a similar "convisceration" of human and divine, thus extended the Incarnation.[52] Christ was carried to the faithful in the form of earthly elements. First spiritually and then corporeally, human beings were sublimated into the body of Christ, like gold that turned to flame but still remained gold, or the moon, carrying the light of the sun but not its heat.[53] The Eucharist ensured that Christian history remained significant, not simply a period of waiting for the end but one in which, through the constant mediation of Christ's body, the reconciliation of humanity and divinity would occur within earthly time.[54] The earthly community's role was to winnow out those who were unworthy of the conjunction of human and divine natures.

In his rigor if not his theology, Rupert echoed early Christian attitudes toward *pax* and *communio*, ideas that changed radically in the wake of religious expansion and Augustinian theology. In the early church, the community had to make judgments and *physically* exclude persons from participation in the rites by refusing them peace. This refusal of peace maintained

50. *Comm. in ev. I.*, 343: "Non nemo indigne manducare potest, sed nemo indigne manducare debet." Bischoff, "Controversy," 84, describes a change in Rupert's earlier position that heretics could not receive the body of Christ to his later argument that they should not: "For Rupert, the question was no longer if unworthy persons could, in fact, receive the true body of Christ, but if on scriptural authority they should receive it. It was a question of the moral, not of the factual order."

51. Rupert, *De divinis officiis* 2.8, PL 170:40B. The Eucharist is an analogy of the God-man conjunction in Christ.

52. *Comm. in ev. I.*, 341: "Unitas enim Verbi, unum efficit corpus Christi, ut illud quod tunc in cruce pependit, et istud quod nunc Ecclesiae fides ore sacro conficit, unum corpus sit; una, inquam, caro, et unus sanguis sit." (Indeed [this is] the unity of the Word, the body of Christ makes one, so that what then hung on the cross and what now the faithful of the church consume as sacrament by mouth is one body; one flesh and one blood.) See the discussion in Bischoff, "Controversy," 68–69 and 146.

53. Bischoff, "Controversy," 104–105 and 142–143. See also *Comm. in ev. I.*, 370, where Rupert compares the sacrifice of communion to the sacrifice of Isaac. Unlike the Old Testament sacrifice, in this case there is no substitution of elements, just their concorporation.

54. Bischoff, "Controversy," 69.

the unity of Christians against the world while also ensuring that the Spirit was not offended by the participation of the wicked. Much like Tertullian, with whom he shares a rhetorical flair and disdain for philosophy, Rupert defined the church in terms of its outlines, not its internal bonds. Internally, the church was as simple as the body of God; through union with Christ, it possessed a uniform distribution of graces. For these reasons, membership must be exclusive and carefully guarded.[55] His opponent in the Judas debate took his cue from Augustine and argued the reverse, that in fact a love of peace determined who should and should not be a member of the community. In the Eucharist, every person took up the unity of Christ's body, even the wicked, as Paul's admonition to unworthy recipients implied (1 Cor. 11.29).[56] But if not held together by peace, humanity could not be absorbed in the body of the Lord. In order to live from the Lord's body, those who accepted the body of Christ "should be mutually united not only through love (*dilectio*) of the head but also through that of our members."[57] This love Alger conceived as the *vinculum pacis* that was the vivifying principle of the body. Integral to the enjoyment of this godly peace was the realization that human beings could not exclude one another from God's body. The Eucharist *itself* determined who became a living member of Christ and who remained a vestigial limb.

The Augustinian Legacy of Alger's Sacramentology

Alger responded in Augustinian terms to Rupert's denial of Judas's communion, not just because Augustine was the most venerable or accessible authority on the subject of sacraments but because Augustine had explicitly linked the sacraments to Alger's own concern: membership in the Christian community of grace. Augustine confronted problems of membership early in his role as pastor at Hippo, and Donatist disruptions in fourth-century Carthage eventually pushed him to agree with church leaders who advocated coercion of schismatic movements. His justification, *compelle intrare* (force them to enter), seems to mark a departure for someone who generally

55. See Rupert, *De divinis officiis*, 2.8, 40B; Bischoff, "Controversy," 111.

56. *De sacramentis corp.*, 800D: "Multi enim indigne accipiunt, de quibus Apostolus ait: *Qui manducat et bibit calicem Domini indigne, judicium sibi manducat et bibit.*" And also 801C: "Corpus enim Domini et sanguis Domini nihilominus erat etiam illis, de quibus dicebat Apostolus: *Qui manducat et bibit indigne, judicium sibi manducat et bibit*."

57. *De sacramentis corp.*, 749C: "Quia igitur corpus Christi sumus qui corpus Christi accipimus, non solum capiti per dilectionem, sed etiam cum membris nostris invicem uniri debemus."

insisted that the draw to Christ be willing. Ultimately, Augustine decided, once schismatics had entered willy-nilly it might be possible to induce in them emotional directives that generated a true bond with Christ and his community.[58] Above all, the church must make itself a broad and open tent, not resisting, as the Donatists had, those who appeared feeble in spirit.

In Augustine's time, Emperor Theodosius had taken measures to eradicate paganism and make Nicaean Christianity the only official religion of empire.[59] However, the uniformity demanded by this Roman gift of peace exposed fault lines and raised old grievances. The North African church, that crucible of militant martyrdom and sacramental controversy, tended to fracture at moments when the world offered it peace. Bishops who now relied on state authority to suppress dissent and eliminate rivals called up memories of traitors who had handed over texts and persons during the persecutions. In Carthage, during the Diocletianic persecutions, imprisoned Christians from the Numidian village of Abitina had been allowed to starve to death, possibly with the collaboration of the bishop Mensurius and his subdeacon Caecilian. Mensurius died in 311, but after liberation, a largely Numidian faction had refused to allow Caecilian to become the new bishop. His opponents elected their own bishops, the second of whom, Donatus the Great, earned the faction the derisive label "Donatists." The Donatists insisted that those who had lapsed during times of trouble should now be rebaptized when they returned to the church in a time of peace. They claimed Cyprian as their exemplar, arguing that the martyred bishop of Carthage had insisted on a new baptism of the lapsed. The result was a split in the North African church that peaked during Saint Augustine's tenure at Hippo-Regius and may have persisted until the arrival of Islam.[60]

Catholics also turned to the example of Cyprian and presented their debate through Cyprianist concerns. Even in Cyprian's day, the prospect of multiple bishops had been an abomination, since it endangered the validity of the sacraments; now, that danger had been exaggerated. Optatus of Milevis

58. See Peter Brown, "St. Augustine's Attitude to Religious Coercion," *Journal of Roman Studies* 54 (1964): 107–116. Cf. Luke 14.16–24, the parable of the unwilling wedding guests.

59. Under Theodosius, the Roman establishment pursued a series of repressive measures against pagans, encouraged by bishops, including possibly Augustine himself. Until 404–405, Catholic bishops resisted asking for the same measures against Donatists, but in 405 they requested and received from Theodosius the "Edict of Unity," which legislated the forcible prevention of schism. R. A. Markus, *Saeculum: History and Society in the Theology of St. Augustine*, rev. ed. (Cambridge, 1988), 137.

60. W. H. C. Frend, *The Donatist Church: A Movement of Protest in Roman North Africa* (Oxford, 1952).

wrote a tract opposing the Donatist bishop Parmenian and presented peace as the opposite of schism. The Donatists, as proponents of one, were opponents of the other, and guilty of deluding the unwary:[61]

> If this peace [that Christ left] had remained sound and unblemished as it was given, and had not been disturbed by the authors of schism, today there would be no dissension between us and our brothers . . . nor would they be incurring the names and actions of false prophets, nor would they be building up a tumbledown and whitewashed wall, nor would they be ruining those whose minds, though less astute, are yet merely simple.

Augustine of Hippo agreed with other Catholics that the Donatists had seduced foolish minds into an act of dissension. By offering to the unwary their own sacraments in place of those of the church, they demonstrated that they hated peace. Unlike Optatus, however, Augustine rearranged the relationship between peace and the sacraments and in that sense departed from the pattern of Cyprian. The sacraments did not confer peace on the recipient; instead they proved and activated peace that he or she already possessed. Augustine knew that the Donatist confessors had claimed the late Cyprian as their spokesman.[62] However he denied them their exemplar, asserting that despite major errors regarding the sacraments, the martyr bishop had shown his love for the church's peace.[63] Dissension made while saving the church's peace was not schism any more than dying in battle *without* love for ecclesiastical peace was martyrdom.[64] The Donatists were schismatic because they did not love peace, and their rigor was devoid of *caritas*. Thus their commitment

---

61. Optatus, *Contra Donatistas* 1.1, ed. Carl Ziwsa, CSEL 26:3.

62. Augustine, *De baptismo* 1.1.1, 145. Peter P. Brown, *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography* (Berkeley, 1969), 214.

63. Augustine, *De baptismo* 1.18.28, 170–173; also 1.19.29, 173: "nimium miseri et nisi se corrigant a semet ipsis omnino damnati, qui hoc in tanto viro eligunt imitari quod illi propterea non obfuit, quia in eam pacem, unde isti aberrarunt qui viam *pacis* non cognoverunt, perseverantissimis usque in finem gressibus ambulavit." (How wretched and—unless they correct themselves—utterly damned in their own words are they who elect to imitate in such a great man that one [flaw] that did not injure him, since he walked with most persevering steps in this peace to the end, whence those who erred "did not know the way of peace" [Rom. 3.17]).

64. Augustine, *De baptismo* 1.18.27, 170: "in qua tamen si aliud alii et aliud alii adhuc de ista quaestione salva pace sentirent, donec universali concilio unum aliquid eliquatum sincerumque placuisset, humanae infirmitatis errorem cooperiret caritas unitatis, sicut scriptum est: quia caritas cooperit multitudinem peccatorum." (Even if some feel one thing and another regarding this question [of baptism] while preserving peace, then until by universal accord something pure and clear is resolved, the love of unity (*caritas unitatis*) should cover the error of human infirmity, just as it is written, "for charity covers a multitude of sins" (1 Pet. 4.8; cf. Prov. 10.12).

to its unity was false, and their sacraments inefficacious.[65] The schismatics had only demonstrated that while all legitimately baptized persons could physically participate in the church, those who failed to cherish the bond of peace could not become thriving members.

In Augustine's vision of the church, true and false peace took new meanings, defined primarily by the goals, intentions, and loves that sanctified obedience. Love of peace came from God, not from the actions of the priest. Thus, the ritual relied for its efficacy on peace that had already been conveyed. In *City of God*, the *Tractates on John's Gospel*, and in his allegorical reading of Genesis, Augustine established a framework for recognizing true peace while still on earth, and for making peace the basis of engagement in politics and society. He employed a sociopolitical analogy for peacemaking: proper conduct of the household, in this case the household of spirit and flesh, with spirit playing the part of householder.[66] The peace of a kingdom, city, or home extended from the peace between reason and carnality that individuals enjoyed. The sacraments became the occasion for activation of this peace, which would allow absorption within the general peace of Christ's body.

Membership in the true community of the church required not physical participation but rather a common understanding and acceptance of the mystery of the Eucharist. The church was a community sanctified by the grace that obtained in the process of sensing, recognizing, and delighting in the sacrament of Christ's body. This pleasure principle could operate only in a self that had acquired discernment through love of genuine peace. Recognition of the grace conveyed by the sacred sign thus required its own act of peacemaking: the recipient's spirit and flesh must act in concord so that Christ's body may be discerned from the sacramental materials. By means of this mutual understanding of sacred signs, a community formed to be consecrated and nourished in Christ.

Augustine's sacramentology marked a break from Cyprian, their divergent views symptomatic of the church's growth and changing needs. What seems a theological quibble between Augustine and Cyprian has roots in the extraordinary political transformations that separated them. While Cyprian's discussions of the sacrament remained centered on the troubles of a fledgling third-century institution, Augustine's stemmed from his theology of the fall, human redemption and transformation through grace in a world where

65. Augustine, *De baptismo* 1.8.11, 157: "non cessat misericordia dei per unitatem sanctae ecclesiae, ut veniant et curentur per medicamentum reconciliationis, per *vinculum pacis*." ([To prevent persons from dying from the wound of schism (*vulnere schismatis*) while having faith without *caritas*] God's mercy does not cease, through the unity of the holy church, so that they may come and be cured through the remedy of reconciliation, through the bond of peace.)

66. See below, chapter 5.

Christians were kings not slaves. Whereas Cyprian conceived of the sacraments as the key to ecclesial discipline, and thus to peace, Augustine insisted that in fact disciplining and peace *allowed* human beings to extract maximum benefit from the sacraments. While Cyprian had conceived of discipline as a taming process, a way to keep martyrs from subverting church leadership, for Augustine, discipline was a transformation of desire, an arousal of the spirit in an insurrection against the rule of the flesh.

And thus it was with Augustine's explanation of communion. For those thinkers who understood Christian community as an imitation of the Last Supper, the synoptic Gospels with their straightforward accounts of the Passion offered accessible models. Searching instead for a community of desire, Augustine turned to mystery not history, explicating the Gospel of John—that most enigmatic of scriptural texts—for his congregants at the weekly Mass in Hippo. In Augustine's *Tractates on John's Gospel* Augustine uses the verb *pascor* (ruminate) in reference to the passage from sign to meaning in both scripture and sacrament.[67] John's gospel allowed Christians to extract nourishment via two related signs: words and the Word. Jesus told a gathering of followers and opponents: "He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood abides in me and I in him" (John 6.57). Most who heard him were horrified at the idea, and even his disciples muttered that this was "a hard saying."[68] Augustine speaks of this mystery as a "veiled grace," similar in that sense to the mystery of the sacraments that challenge the senses of the flesh in order to win through to the senses of the spirit.[69] The purpose of the mystery was to increase attentiveness, and by means of this attentiveness to instill a sense of community among the "little souls" in Augustine's congregation who lacked not faith but wisdom. Comprehension would nourish them.

The Eucharist, Membership, and Peace

Alger of Liège followed Augustine in arguing that community formation was an emotional process, tagged to the senses. As Nicholas Häring points out, Alger had limited direct knowledge of Augustine's writings and instead

67. *Tr. in J.* 2.1, 11.

68. Kenneth Hein, *Eucharist and Excommunication: A Study in Early Christian Doctrine and Discipline* (Bern, 1973), 23, suggests that the audience's horror may be an allusion to the Jewish prohibition against blood drinking.

69. *Tr. in J.* 27.2, 270. Augustine insists that the intellect has its own pleasures separate from those of the body (*Tr. in J.* 26.4, 261). These pleasures become the target of evangelization, which is ultimately an attempt to draw a person to the altar not through obligation but through delight.

seems to have received his Augustine via Ivo of Chartres's *Decretum* and the writings of Lanfranc.[70] But through his appropriation of these epitomes, Alger aligned himself with a group of like-minded sacramental and ecclesiological thinkers. Like Augustine, who had grown up in a church that was still negotiating its relationship with empire, thinkers like Alger found themselves having to treat the world not as a hurdle but as an instrument for the formation of spiritual community. As the geographical and jurisdictional boundaries of the church expanded in the twelfth century, it became essential to mediate between the church's divinely conferred ideal and its present temporal form. Defined in Augustinian terms, the sacrament—a sign accessible to the flesh but demanding recognition by the spirit—enabled this mediation. Augustine had argued that the locus of mediation had to be the human will, and scholars like Alger extended this argument, to show how taste and perception determined spiritual transformation.

For Alger, the mystery of communion became the occasion through which divine grace transformed human perception. Following his reading of Augustine (via the epitome of Ivo) a sacrament was "a sacred sign" and in that sense "the visible form of an invisible grace."[71] Only those whose senses had truly transformed could participate in the peace of Christ's body. The sacrament therefore controlled church membership not by incorporating all humanity in the Godhead but instead by conveying salvific mercy only to those recipients who were worthy of it. The result was a living, vital body of Christ, but from this body might hang vestigial and lifeless limbs. Judas was the paradigmatic vestigial limb, whose hardness of heart and hatred of peace had prevented him from accessing the life of the community.

Both Rupert and Alger argued that the resolution of discord between man and his Creator could be achieved only by the mediation of God himself, but they differed on the exact principle of mediation. Rupert's Christology emphasized the continuing role of the Incarnation in the mediation between God and humanity; Alger, on the other hand, looked to a more general, ahistorical mediation, understood in Augustinian terms, as grace. According to Alger, it was not the bestowal of Christ's body but the mercy enacted

70. Häring, "Sacramentology," 58.

71. *De sacramentis corp.*, 751C-D. Häring, "Sacramentology," 56, argues that this version of the definition came from Berengar of Tours, who attributed it to Augustine, and that Alger took it (as he took much of "Augustine") from Ivo's *Decretum*, where that author had attributed it to Augustine "et alibi." However, see the discussion of a sacrament in similar terms in Augustine, *Quaestiones in Heptateuchum* 3.84, ed. I. Fraipont, CCSL 33:227–228 (Lev. 21.15).

through the performance of the sacrament that allowed persons to benefit.[72] During communion, the individual communicant was able to participate in the virtue of the sacrament. Alger quoted Augustine's Easter sermon *On the Sacraments of the Faithful*: "Since he suffered for us, he commended to us in this sacrament his Body and Blood, that he also makes us ourselves. . . . For we have also become his body. And through his mercy, we are that which we receive."[73] Man was not saved through the physical consumption of Christ's flesh. The Eucharist was not, as Rupert had argued, the means of communicating the saving flesh in a comestible form.[74] Instead, through God's mercy, persons were allowed to be a part of Christ's body, for the purpose of living from it.

Membership among the saved was to be decided not by human beings but by God. Priests might administer the sacrament perfectly, but that by itself did not guarantee eternal life for the recipient. Alger remembered Augustine's admonition that simply receiving the body does not mean that one may be nourished by it.[75] The Eucharist was the whole church of which the worthy recipient was a thriving member. When communicants efficaciously received the Eucharist, they were already "that [body] which we receive." It was being a part of that body that allowed one the chance to receive the Eucharist in a spiritually beneficial manner.[76] While the sacrament was always valid, and the Lord's body always whole, in order to continue to live

---

72. *De sacramentis corp.*, 798D: "bonos vere omnino credamus corpus Christi sumere; malos autem vere quidem quantum ad substantiam, et non vere quantum ad effectus gratiam." (We believe that good people truly assume the body of Christ completely; wicked people certainly [do so] truly as far as the substance goes, and not truly as far as the grace of the performance.)

73. *De sacramentis corp.*, 749C: "Quia passus est pro nobis, commendavit nobis in isto sacramento corpus et sanguinem suum, quod etiam fecit nos ipsos. . . . Nam et nos corpus ipsius facti sumus: et misericordia ipsius quod accipimus nos sumus."

74. See Rupert, *De divinis officiis* 2.19, 41D.

75. *Tr. in J.* 26.11, 265: "Quam multi de altari accipiunt et moriuntur, et accipiendo moriuntur?" (How many accept from the altar and die, and die even while accepting?)

76. *De sacramentis corp.*, 800D, quoting Augustine on John's gospel: "Quid est Christum manducare? Non hoc solum est in sacramento corpus eius accipere. Multi enim indigne acccipiunt. . . . Sed quomodo manducandus est Christus? Quomodo ipse dicit: *Qui manducat carnem meam, et bibit sanguinem meum, in me manet et ego in eo.* Si in me manet et ego in eo, tunc manducat et bibit. Qui autem in me non manet nec ego in eo, et si accipit scramentum, acquirit magnum tormentum" (cf. 1 Cor. 11.29). (What is it to eat Christ? It is not only to accept his body in sacrament. Indeed, many people accept it without being worthy. . . . But how should Christ be eaten? He himself says how: *Who eats my flesh and drinks my blood lives in me and I in him.* If he remains in me and I in him, then he eats and drinks. Moreover, he who does not remain in me, nor I in him, if he also accepts the sacrament, acquires great torment.)

from it, it was necessary to preserve and participate in the church's peace and unity.[77] Although he was a sinner, Judas was not denied the Lord's body. To do so would have meant a division of Christ's body, which Jesus would not allow.[78] Thus Judas was excluded only from peace and unity, the virtues and vivifying effects of the Lord's body.

The sacrament bestowed peace through a process of transformed perception: common spiritual and physical apprehension of a sign. The process of visualizing mercy in the sign was a matter of negotiation and communication between spirit and flesh. Since to the external, mortal perception, the sacramental material remained unchanged, reception of the sacrament required transformation, not just of the consecrated materials but also of the recipient's sensory faculties. While most signs implied a disjuncture or a distance to mediate between what signified and what was signified, the Eucharist was special because the signifier and signified were one and the same. Christ promised this when he said the bread and wine *were* his body.[79] The word of God was also God, both as signifier (*signum*) and signified (*res*), and so only in the Word was the tension between letter and spirit resolved.[80] When properly partaking of the Eucharist, the interior and exterior senses of the recipient were able to approximate this concord—to imitate it in the right way. The sacrament was therefore an exercise, a guide to the ultimate act of peacemaking between spirit and flesh that would take place at the end of time, outside of time.

---

77. *De sacramentis corp.*, 750B, quoting Augustine: "sicut caput non est vitale sine corpore, sic Christus nulli vitam confert sine unitate corporis Ecclesiae." (Just as the head has no life without the body, so Christ confers life to no one without the unity of the body of the church.)

78. *Tr. in J.* 50.10, 437.

79. *De sacramentis corp.*, 751D–752A. Alger specifies that the sacrament is the visible sign that signifies, while a mystery is the hidden thing that is signified. However, "nec mirum, si *sacramentum* pro sacramento et re sacramenti saepius ponitur; quia et corpus Christi pro sacramento et corpore Christi inventiur." (No wonder if *sacramentum* is often put in place for both sacrament and *res*, since the body of Christ was acquired both for a sacrament and for the body of Christ.) In Augustine's words, Alger notes, "The body of Christ is both truth and figure: Truth when it is made the body and blood of Christ, by virtue of the spirit in His own Word, out of the substances of bread and wine. But what is a figure is that which is perceived externally." *De sacramentis corp.*, 752A: "Corpus Christi et veritas et figura est. Veritas dum corpus Christi et sanguis, virtute Spiritus in verbo ipsius, ex panis vinique substantia efficitur. Figura vero est, id quod exterius sentitur."

80. *De sacramentis corp.*, 751D–752A: "Nec solummodo sacramentum pro alterutro, id est, vel pro signo vel pro signato invenitur, sed etiam pro utroque. Sicut cum dicitur: Verbum caro factum est, caro pro carne et anima. Itemque: Omnis anima potestatibus sublimioribus subdita sit: anima pro carne et anima accipitur." (Nor was the sacrament bestowed just for one or the other, that is, either for sign or for signified, but indeed for both. Just as when it is said, *The word was made flesh* [John 1. 15] flesh [stands] for flesh and soul, so also *Every soul should lie under the sublime powers* [Rom. 13.1] is taken [to say] soul for flesh and soul.)

Successful peacemaking determined whether a person lived in or died from the consumption of Christ's body in sacrament: "He who accepts the mystery of our unity, and does not preserve the bond of peace accepts not the mystery for himself but a judgment against himself" (cf. 1 Cor. 11.29).[81] The *res*, that thing signified by the sacrament, also included those who received the sign completely: it was the faith of all those who shared in it in the proper manner, "with mutual loving among them."[82] Theologians believed that this ability to love was God's grace, a gift communicated by the Holy Spirit acting within them.[83] This grace extended to all who wished faithfully to be part of the Lord's body, and who came together through a desire for unity. "When Christ conforms and unites [persons]," Alger says, "anyone can be a participant of such a great society."[84] At the center of this great society was "the one same and true mediator, reconciling us with God through the sacrifice of peace."[85] It was the *vinculum pacis* that held members within the church and was their means of benefiting from the Savior's sacrifice. By calling it the basis of a "mystical unity" of members that was first sensed with sweetness as his body, in his body, Alger fitted peace into a process that linked the sensual, visible creation with invisible reality.[86]

In his understanding of the sacraments, Alger echoed contemporaries who had also made conflict between spirit and flesh the basis of a great society of peace. Jay Rubenstein notes the similarity between Alger's theology and that of his northern French contemporary Guibert of Nogent. A common thread is their theory of practice, how through communion the believer relives not the Supper but Christ's torment and crucifixion: conformity with Christ is both commemoration and imitation of the event,

---

81. *De sacramentis corp.*, 750D: "Qui accipit mysterium unitatis, et non tenet vinculum pacis, non mysterium pro se, sed testimonium accipit contra se." Note that by *mysterium* Alger refers to that which is conveyed through the *sacramentum*.

82. *De sacramentis corp.*, 750A. See also 751A: "Inasmuch as Christ as our head is substantially and truly the principal virtue and *res* of the sacrament, you the church form the society and unity of the church."

83. David Bell, *The Image and Likeness: The Augustinian Spirituality of William of St Thierry* (Kalamazoo, MI, 1984), 128–135.

84. *De sacramentis corp.*, 750A: "quicunque tantae societatis, conformante et veniente Christo, vere particeps esse potuerit."

85. *De sacramentis corp.*, 770C: "idem unus ipsi verusque mediator per sacrificium *pacis* reconcilians nos Deo."

86. *De sacramentis corp.*, 749C: "Quae unitas vera Dei dilectione servatur, ad corpus suum corpori suo, id est nobis uniatur."

by means of which the flesh with its desires is crucified.[87] Rubenstein notes that, according to Alger, "Anyone can partake of the real, physical presence. Only a select few gain through it a place in the figurative representation of church unity, which is the sacrament's real benefit. A person cannot join this *societas* unless he personally reenacts Christ's passion and meditates upon it through communion."[88] In Guibert's treatise on the veneration of relics, similar words are put in the mouth of an anonymous adversary: "In my opinion to eat is nothing other than to exemplify the life of Jesus."[89] According to Rubenstein that adversary was Guibert himself, disguising older arguments within a revised version of his treatise.[90] In the twelfth century, exemplification of Christ meant not just a spiritual transformation but a physical, sensory one as well. Worshippers relived the Passion, and in the crucifixion (i.e., subjugation) of their own fleshly sensations, they were able simultaneously to taste the sweetness and pain of Christ's sacrifice. This rupture and repair between the desires of spirit and flesh was the initial process of peacemaking within saved persons.

For Hugh of Saint-Victor, the sacraments were "instituted for instruction, in order that, through what can be discerned in the sacrament in its visible elements (*species*), the ignorant human mind might learn to recognize the invisible virtue in the real basis (*res*) of the sacrament."[91] The sacraments restored order against the chaos of a human mind that had been consumed by concupiscence.[92] Man's redemption lay in returning to God through his own mortality and blindness.[93] Adam's disobedience had put a cloud between

87. Rubenstein, Guibert of Nogent, 155. See *De sacramentis corp.*, 797D.

88. Rubenstein, *Guibert of Nogent*, 155.

89. Guibert, *De pigneribus* 2, 121, quoted in Rubenstein, *Guibert of Nogent*, 155, as part of this argument.

90. Rubenstein, *Guibert of Nogent*, 143, 150, and 158–171. Lacking perhaps the theological sophistication of Alger, Guibert's early Eucharistic speculations led him to the brink of heresy. Through an invented adversary, then, he presents a "battered Eucharistic theology" that closely resembles Alger's orthodox version.

91. Hugh of Saint-Victor, *De sacramentis* 1.9.3, 320A: "Propter eruditionem quoque instituta sunt *sacramenta*, ut per id quod foris in sacramento in specie visibili cernitur, ad invisibilem virtutem quae intus in re sacramenti constat agnoscendum mens humana erudiatur."

92. Hugh, *De sacramentis* 1.9.3, 320A. According to Hugh, the sacraments exercised the mind, so that while it was engaged with external things, it could simultaneously become fertile to the internal fruit of obedience. For Alger, communion is a moment of clarity, while for Hugh it is still preparation for clarity.

93. Hugh, *De sacramentis* 1.9.3, 319A-322A. The sacraments were insituted in order to build humility, erudition, and exercise. They allowed man, "ipsa sua humiliatione," to be reconciled to the Creator. See also *Archa* 4.6, 101–102.

humanity and redemption, so unless taught by visible things, human beings could never perceive the divine. The redemptive sacraments were therefore invisible works but mercifully conveyed to human beings by means of things that they could see and grasp.

Human beings could ascend from visible to invisible, from letter to spirit, in several ways. Hugh called the six days of visible creation the first great sacraments.[94] Hugh's entire approach to the perception of reality can be called a "sacramental approach." Since the works of creation and redemption were books written by God, the exercise of interpreting creation exercised one's faith.[95] In *De sacramentis Christianae fidae* Hugh began his discussion of God's works by discussing visible things because the human mind needed to be led from material evidence to knowledge of the hidden, to ascend from the "visible to the invisible."[96] Material things were therefore not just temptations but also the starting point for transformation. Through them the outer man must "prepare a medicine for the interior man and also learn to submit to him and profit him."[97] In this way Adam's children returned to God through the very things that led their parents astray.

New interests in proper, sensory response to material things were preludes to changes that Caroline Walker Bynum has identified in the piety of the later Middle Ages. Bynum reminds us: "Although theologians and visionaries never forgot that the bread on the altar was the memorial of a communal, Passover meal and of Old Testament sacrifice, they increasingly emphasized the eucharist as suffering and bleeding flesh."[98] In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the moment of salvation was understood as the Crucifixion and not the Incarnation or the Resurrection.[99] A large part of this change, Bynum argues, had to do with the growing "sense of body as locus of the divine."[100] This change extended to the idea of *imitatio Christi*. Where in the

94. Hugh, *De sacramentis* 1.1.12, 195C-197B.

95. Hugh's model was Augustine. Augustine had presented creation as a mystery, with more questions than answers. The obscurity of certain passages in Genesis could only be explained as the inability of the human senses to grasp the entire mystery of creation. The words of the sacred writer presented puzzles to the reader that must not be escaped. Meaning, when it finally emerged from the text, would enhance the internal illumination of the reader.

96. Hugh, *De sacramentis* 1.5.1, 245D: "ut de visibilibus ad invisibilia conscendamus."

97. Hugh, *De sacramentis* 1.9.3, 321B: "medicinam interioris hominis exterior homo praepararet, et subesse et prodesse addisceret."

98. C. W. Bynum, *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women* (Berkeley, 1987), 251–252.

99. Ibid., 252.

100. Ibid., 252 and 255.

early and mid-twelfth century, it was meditation on Christ's life and compassion for others, by 1200, holy persons actually received his wounds on their bodies or (later still) acted out his persecution.[101] Alger resisted the idea that there was the flesh of an actual human being on the altar. Nonetheless, ironically, his emphasis on empathetic communion was part of the transference from mystical *corpus* to wounded flesh. By the thirteenth century, to participate in the body of Christ had become a matter of sensory, if not yet bodily, sympathy.

Eucharistic Subjectivity and Institutional Transformation

The *vinculum pacis* of the Lord's body was the standard for the pact of peace within any sworn association. Through a process of reinvention, individuals became part of a new collective, to whose peace they were sworn, even as that peace preserved their own existence. For this reason, Alger speaks of the sacrament as an oath or a promise.[102] By associating church membership with internal transformation, the sacramental theology that Alger espoused combined individual choice with universal identity. The member's love of peace determined how he or she perceived and thus received the communal benefit.[103] Communion thus created a supercommunity of the oath. More than a community, it was quite literally a corporation.

The sacrament simultaneously solved the problem of creating a society of the altar without coercion and ensuring that no matter how much it expanded in the world, and relied on worldly affections, it would never be tainted. The church was protected therefore by what Gerhoh of Reichersberg called "a tunic" of faith, an invisible garment that no king could rend. Since the process of reception ensured that no one of bad faith could share in its peace, the church was able to maintain itself distinct from the world while still partaking of its delights and troubles. At the same time, the corporation of Christ's body combined contractual membership with inherent belonging on a universal scale, subjecting its members to an abstract, monopolistic

101. Ibid., 255–256. Bynum notes that late medieval *imitatio* of the human Christ never denied his divinity.

102. *De sacramentis corp.*, 752B. This promise was made when God transformed himself in order to unite with mankind.

103. To receive anything from the sacrament other than the mystical unity is heresy and damnation. Quoting Augustine's Easter sermon, Alger stresses: "Haeretici quaerunt divisionem, cum panis iste non indicet nisi unitatem." (Heretics seek division, although that bread indicates nothing but unity.) *De sacramentis corp.*, 750A.

authority. They followed the will of the collective because it was their own will united to the life force of the *corpus christianorum*.

In Alger's treatise, corporate and institutional concepts emerged in terms that predate institutionalization itself. Fredric Cheyette has suggested that it is not possible to trace the formation of institutions without first locating the development of institutionalized thinking. This thinking is characterized by an adherence to abstract authority that, according to Cheyette, must be embodied in a text.[104] Persons are loyal to abstract concepts of membership and authority because their participation is contingent on a personal transformation of desire and perception. In the church, this authority was embodied, literally, in a special text, the Word of God as described in the opening verses of John's gospel.

Participation in the institutional church meant that one shared in its peace. Relationships of authority and obedience did not disappear within this body, but domination was replaced by coordination because all participants were willing and had ceded control to the spirit, which then received its directive from divine will. Alger emphasized that membership in Christ's body meant that one must partake of a hierarchy of dignities: the head occupied a special dignity as opposed to other members, and so on.[105] Sacramental membership was corporate membership in the Weberian sense, a transformative form of being and adherence, a dynamic of entry, communication, reception, and perception.[106] In conjunction with this sense of adherence, the debate over Judas's communion highlighted the importance of *corpus*, the physical body, in the twelfth-century understanding of communal membership. The Lord's body was the model for coordinate action

104. Fredric Cheyette, "The Invention of the State," in *Essays on Medieval Civilization*, ed. B. K. Lackner and K. R. Philp (Austin, TX, 1978), 143–178. Cf. Brigitte Bedos-Rezak, "Medieval Identity: A Sign and a Concept," *American Historical Review* 105.5 (2000): 1489–1533, on the process by which relatively unlettered medieval lay aristocrats inscribed and derived presence and identity via the unfamiliar medium of text. I thank Philippe Buc for drawing my attention to the relationship between these two essays.

105. The division of dignities is because we cannot have identity with God in this life but can only begin to recover his image. Participation in him is therefore always approximate. See Alger, *De sacramentis corp.*, 751B.

106. Here I follow Otto Gerhard Oexle's approach to lay associations of peace during the same period. See Oexle, "Peace through Conspiracy," *Ordering Medieval Society: Perspectives on Intellectual and Practical Modes of Shaping Social Relations*, ed. Bernhard Jussen and trans. by Pamela Selwyn (Philadelphia, 2001), esp. 292–293. For an application of these ideas to membership in Christian political orders, see Anton-Hermann Chroust, "The Corporate Idea and the Body Politic in the Middle Ages," *Review of Politics* 60 (1947): 423–452.

and transformation; it was the site for collective peacemaking among God, man, and society.

Dueling Sacraments

The sacramental bond was an expression of twelfth-century "selfhood," which is to say, the dual amplification of personal choice and communal identity; the psychosocial bond of communion expressed the will of members. The internal mystery was divine grace, sensed externally, received internally, and then portrayed externally again. The community that formed through sacramental bonds therefore outwardly displayed its acceptance of grace. It provided an *exemplum* for others, and a pattern for the coordination of the church.

For this reason, the sacraments could also provide a pattern for critique. Those who partook of them without the proper personal transformation were of course damned out of their own mouths. At the same time, it was also possible that other bonds could form that mimicked the sacraments, that required personal transformation and the expression of individual will—but without conferring the benefit of divine grace. Heretics who intentionally performed communion wrongly or left it incomplete committed a great sin, according to Alger. The church condemned their sacraments, although it continued to recognize what remained valid in them.[107] Bonds based on the sacraments, even the bond of excommunication, were insignia that marked a separate society of persons who were committed to their own, immediate benefit rather than to common salvation. Just as there were now antipopes and anti-kings there were also antichurches formed from diabolical sacraments.

Hugh of Saint-Victor said that God had instituted the sacraments to provide an ultimate remedy for man's punishment. Seduced by the devil, the human race was now violently possessed. The sacraments placed on man a sign of future glorification, the rebuttal to his present, temporal shackling. At the same time, the devil also offered sacraments. Rather than a sign of future fulfillment, however, the diabolical sacraments relate to the other meaning of the word "sacrament"—*sacramentum* also meant an oath. Bound to the devil by an oath, his followers became a separate society. The result was a war of insurrection, in which the sacraments were the arms and

107. Häring, "Sacramentology," 63.

insignia of opposing forces.[108] Societies based on sacramental and quasi-sacramental bonds therefore offered both a vision of future peace and a sign of immediate warfare.

This specter of dueling sacraments contributed to obsessions with insult to the Host. The reformers of the second half of the eleventh century had worried about violations of Christ's body through abuses like simony and clerical concubinage. In the twelfth century, as the Eucharist became increasingly associated both with the body of Christ and the mystical collectivity of all Christians, fears of Host desecration also emerged.[109] Outcasts announced themselves by attacking the Host, through wickedness, direct assault, or mimicry. In the imagination of medieval Christians, internal persecutors such as false prophets and simoniacs traded Christ's body as Judas had, while those already outside like the Jews kidnapped the Host, mocked it, threw it to pigs, and even stabbed it.[110] Like Jerusalem besieged, the vision of true peace in the Host provoked the agents of the devil toward a greater wickedness.

Lurking concerns and curiosities about the mystery remained, with the irenic theology of people like Alger proving too abstruse for broad consumption. These concerns reversed themselves in stories of rabbis experimenting on the consecrated Host and women feebly asking what would happen to Christ if rats ate him. Fears of mimicry became the extension of concerns about falsified *pax*. Demonology evolved around anxieties about a negative sacrament: a pact with demons.[111] Paranoia about Jewish conspiracy focused on mutilations of Christian children in gross imitation of the sacrifice. Oath communities appeared to mock the universal community of the church when they imposed the will of a sworn but delimited collective on their members.

---

108. Hugh, *De sacramentis* 1.8.11, 312A-313C, esp. 312B-C: "Proposuit et diabolus sacramenta sua quibus suos sibi alligaret, quatenus ab illis qui ejus imperium detractabant quanto manifestius eos discerneret tanto securius possideret. Coepit ergo genus humanum mox in partes contrarias dividi; aliis diaboli sacramenta suscipientibus, aliis vero suscipientibus sacramenta Christi. Et factae sunt duae familiae, una Christi, altera diaboli. Quid enim verbum incarnatum dixerim, nisi regem qui hunc mundum intravit per assumptam humanitatem cum diabolo bellaturus, et eum exinde quasi tyrannum et violenter in alieno dominantem expulsurus?" The war of sacraments took place through all of time, implying that the Christian faith did not just begin with Christ. Hugh says the soldiers of Christ stretch before and after the Incarnation, like warriors fighting in front of and behind their king. *De sacramentis* 1.8.11, 312C.

109. Gavin Langmuir, *History, Religion, and Anti-Semitism* (Berkeley, 1990), 232–251.

110. See Miri Rubin, *Gentile Tales: The Narrative Assault on Late Medieval Jews* (Philadelphia, 1999), 29–69, for patterns of Host desecration in accusatory narratives.

111. Alain Boureau, *Satan the Heretic: The Birth of Demonology in the Medieval West*, trans. Teresa Lavender Fagan (Chicago, 2006; Fr. orig. 2004), 60–67.

Fantasies grew about "Manichean" ceremonies, where the heretic *perfecti* offered their own sacraments, while immolating an infant.[112] Thus, outcasts inverted the sacrament by miming its superficial and most puzzling attributes.

While early twelfth-century sacramentologies may not explain all these changes, they testify to a cultural change in which the body, its incomprehension, and its appetites had begun to assume significance for collective salvation. As theologians of the sacraments showed, communion produced community by activating desires and senses; it was the proving ground for an individual's commitment to true peace. An association that faithfully resembled the peace of Christ's body testified to the inner peace and moral balance of its members. An oath that caricatured the sacramental bond betrayed the evil that lurked among its members.

The debate over Judas's communion highlights the importance of negotiations between spirit and flesh in the twelfth-century understanding of membership. In communion, the truly peaceful shared in Christ's sacrifice and sensed both the abjection and the glorification: they bowed before the will of the father as Jesus had, and drained the cup of martyrs while tasting the sweetness of the fruits of eternal victory. Everyone else tasted moist bread. A sweetness that could be tasted only by the "pleasures of the intellect" told worshippers where and how they belonged.[113] Altered perception—a new understanding of signs—became the key to authentic participation in the church. At the heart of this model, the bond of peace was not something that could be created or destroyed, gained or lost.[114] It was something in which one shared or did not share. Judas broke from the *spiritual* unity of the church and thus exempted himself from its peace. Even though he physically remained within the apostolic circle, he was as Augustine described him, a dead limb rather than a coordinate member.[115]

Because of his liminal position, the false apostle revealed the outlines and internal constitution of the church. Alger indicated that Judas received the

112. Guibert, *Monodies* 3.17, 430.

113. On the "pleasures of the intellect," see the discussion of Augustine in chapter 5 below.

114. Alger, *De sacramentis corp.*, 785A-D discusses the completeness and indivisibility of the church, as understood through the indivisibility of the body of Christ in the sacrament.

115. *Tr. in J.* 26, 266–267: "Qui vult vivere, habet ubi vivat, habet unde vivat. Accedat, credat, incorporetur, ut vivificetur. Non abhoreat a compage membrorum, non sit putre membrum quod resecari mereatur, non sit distortum de quo erubescatur." (He who wishes to live has the place and the wherewithal to live. He should accept, believe, and be incorporated, in order to be vivified. He should not shrink away from the conjunction of members, should not be a decayed member that needs to be pruned, should not be a disfigurement through which [the body] is embarrassed.)

Lord's body but that his reception in no way afflicted the real church.[116] The communion of Judas was necessary in order to educate the faithful about membership. The true—that is, spiritual—church could not be harmed or even changed by the physical participation of wicked laymen or simoniac priests. Far greater damage was done by denying communion to those perceived to be sinners, for such exclusion mocked traditional consensus and tore at the fabric of ecclesiastical unity.[117] While neutralizing local controversies, Alger had also attempted to place the sacraments beyond political and moral contingencies, allowing the church to be as Tyconius once put it, both "black and beautiful."[118]

Alger was not alone in this vision of the church on earth—and certainly not its pioneer—but he balanced irenicism with orthodoxy at a time when dissatisfaction with the church's political burdens had turned into concerns about sacramental purity. Tertullian in his "Montanist" mode had posited a spiritual church that was not just clothed but also tainted by its institutional counterpart. Heretical movements of the later Middle Ages asserted their membership in a church of the spirit that opposed and mocked what the clerical institution had become. Reform-minded orthodox adopted much the same language, both to criticize clerical abuses and to insist on the immunity of faith from the depredations of the wicked. Alger's treatise may not have been widely popular, but it was well respected. In later years, after Alger had become a Cluniac monk, his abbot, Peter the Venerable, rated *De sacramentis corporis et sanguinis Dominici* above the Eucharistic theology of Lanfranc or Guitmund of Aversa. After his death, *De sacramentis* enjoyed a modicum of popularity, not just among Alger's fellow Cluniacs—from whom we hear high praise—but also around northern France and Germany:

---

116. *De sacramentis corp.*, 802C: "Quia enim Judas accusatus et damnatus non fuerat, ideo Christus conscientiam ejus perversam, quamvis sibi notam, damnare noluit, ut nos instrueret, quod aliquorum pravitas, nec conversatione, nec sacramentorum consecratione vel comparticipatione bonis aliquatenus nocere possit." (Indeed since Judas was not accused and damned, at that point, Christ did not want to damn his perverse conscience, although it was known to him, as he wished to instruct us, that the depravity of anyone is not able to harm the good people to any extent, either through conversation, or through the consecration or distribution of the sacraments.)

117. *De sacramentis corp.*, 800B-C: "Since therefore Leo says the traitor was not excluded and this same communion of the sacraments was not negated, and likewise Augustine says the same Judas was present when the Lord had distributed the sacrament of his body and blood to all the disciples—indeed the evangelist Luke affirms this with his testimony—it should appear how Judas and other wicked people are understood to assume the body of Christ and understood not to assume it, so that the Fathers in whom there was one spirit, not of dissension but of peace, seem to dissent from one another not even as to this."

118. Tyconius, *Liber regularum* 2, ed. and trans. William S. Babcock (Atlanta, 1989), 18.

Saint-Vaast, Alençon, Saint-Evroult, Afflighem, and Maria Laach.[119] The demurs of William of Saint-Thierry show that the text remained in circulation into the 1140s.[120] Gerhoh of Reichersberg did not agree with all points of Alger's sacramentology, but he did share his belief in the unblemished continuity of faith. Gerhoh described the church as an edifice of God, built on a scaffolding of the wicked. At the present time, the scaffolding remained a part of the structure, but it was always meant to fall away as an aspect of the completion of the edifice.[121] So, too, abusive leaders like Judas would be cast off the body of Christ as dead limbs.

Canon lawyers were familiar with at least some of Alger's work, as his *Liber de misericordia et iustitia* had greatly influenced Gratian's *Decretum*.[122] Around 1186, the canon lawyer Rufinus of Sorrento wrote that all peace was a sacrament but that the peace of the devil with human beings represented its "rude and undigested material."[123] By the nature of their bond, therefore, members of a diabolical peace parodied participants of a Christian peace. This "sacramental standard" of personal transformation was the basis of suspicion of all oath communities not constituted under the aegis of the clerically administered Eucharist. Since the sacrament of communion revealed who was truly at peace and who was not, any peace made outside this sacrament was automatically suspect as false.

Ideal peace and its closest approximation looked very different to the untrained eye. One was a constant struggle for right concord in the human body, while the other the identity of glorified flesh and spirit in the body of Christ.[124] By taking up Christ in the Eucharist, the human being experienced in some sense the peace of the divine body. Even if members of a redeemed church could never fully express on an individual level the peace that held them in the body of Christ, the bond of peace marked them out for future glorification. But not only were these sacraments the insignia of this redeemed society, they also provided the discipline that such a society

119. Häring, "Sacramentology," 66–67. Alger became a monk and retired to Cluny a few years after writing *De sacramentis corporis et sanguinis dominici.*

120. Häring, "Sacramentology," 64–69, and 74–76, on Alger's influence and lack thereof.

121. Gerhoh of Reichersberg, *Liber de aedificio Dei*, PL 194:1194.

122. Häring, "Sacramentology," 67.

123. Rufinus of Sorrento, *De bono pacis* 1.2, ed. Roman Deutinger, MGH Studien und Texte 17:58.

124. The church reform of the twelfth century can thus be described as an attempt to bridge the gap between two bodies, those of man and Christ. For antecedents of this idea in Paschasius Radbertus, see Karl F. Morrison, *The Mimetic Tradition of Reform in the West* (Princeton, NJ, 1982), 165–168

would need if it was to meet the challenges of the *saeculum*. As the next two chapters show, conceptions of peace as emotional discipline shaped the twelfth-century clergy's understanding of relationships between spirit and flesh and church and world. Medieval evangelists cast themselves as peacemakers, bringing transformative sacraments of word and Word to communities on the fringes of Christendom.

Chapter 5

Inner Peace

Discord, Discretion, and Discipline

"This is a hard saying." . . . "Does it shock you?" (John 6.60–61)

The disgust of Jesus's listeners at being asked to eat his flesh showed the difficulties that a carnal understanding of the sacraments placed in the way of spiritual benefit. No matter how carefully the sacraments were guarded and explained, it was no easy matter to absorb these mysteries of divine redemption. True membership in the church required discernment (*discretio*). For high medieval thinkers who followed Augustine, the sacraments did not open the gates to a community of peace but rather conferred peace by demanding that the recipient rearrange his or her emotional priorities. This peace meant a transformation of the senses, the victory of spirit over flesh resulting in the ability to reject what the body had craved. Grace came as a challenge and provocation, not as an easy escape or reward: it was a call to battle between spirit and flesh. Peacemaking through discernment began as transformative turbulence and culminated in the disciplining of emotions.

Scriptural commentators in early twelfth-century Europe maintained that conflict between spirit and flesh generated clarity of sensation. This discernment not only benefited the self but also provided vital benefit for all of society and politics. In a world of mirrors and distortions, potential existed for the formation of communities in which peace had been

fabricated or inverted, in which violence hid behind a lack of open hostility. Those who distorted peace remained "hidden in the reeds, in the moist places," to infect others.[1] Fighting was only one of several indicators of this falsification, and a cessation of hostilities was only a sign of peace, not peace itself. Discernment thus became key to proper community formation. Medieval Christians had to develop an ability to read the signs that the world displayed to them. And they had to learn where their confusion originated in order to combat it.

The men who took the lead in this endeavor included those whom Richard Southern once described, almost apologetically, as "withdrawn from the world and speaking to a very few," those who nonetheless shepherded "secret and momentous changes in thought and feeling, and the direction of society for both secular and spiritual ends."[2] In fact, Southern underestimated their level of conversation with the world. In the university towns of northern France, these "protoscholastics" witnessed urban conflict and discord within the church. They chastised the perpetrators of violence, including sometimes themselves, and attributed loss of peace to a lack of discernment. They also trained their senses to "pierce the heavens" by means of scriptural exegesis, a struggle with the epiphenomena of text in order to achieve its redemptive essence (*res*).[3]

Twelfth-century schoolmen imagined inner peace as liberation from the tyranny of the superficial, and they saw exegesis as a mode of aesthetic training. Even as it provided the answers to present dilemmas through examination of the sacred page, exegetical discipline transformed its practitioners. By transcending the material sign of the word, readers were forced to combat their own sensory processes and, consequently, alter their sensibilities. A transformation of the guiding pleasure principle allowed troubled humanity to recognize, desire, and ultimately delight in true peace. In this sense, exegesis elicited the same peacemaking processes as a sacrament. Like the revolutionary program of the Hildebrandine popes, this peacemaking process was counterintuitive. The self must be forced to undergo a civil war,

1. Rufinus of Sorrento, *De bono pacis* 1.8, ed. Roman Deutinger, MGH Studien und Texte 17:76. Cf. Job 40.16.

2. R. W. Southern, *The Making of the Middle Ages* (New Haven, CT, 1953), 13.

3. Augustine Thompson uses this happy phrase for intellectuals in the growing cities and communes of high medieval Europe: "those whose spiritual senses could pierce the heavens." Thompson, *Cities of God: The Religion of the Italian Communes, 1125–1325* (University Park, PA, 2005), 149.

where reason rose up against carnality and asserted legitimate "husbandry" of the soul. This was a disciplining process, and one that demanded a transformation of desire. In most if not all persons, the war would be constant while they lived on earth, and tranquility achieved only in the eternal silence of celestial Jerusalem. Nonetheless, this internal turbulence provided the closest approximation of true peace on earth.

An Augustinian Problematic

As with several other dichotomies of human existence, the epitome of turbulent internal disciplining was Saint Augustine's confrontation with his own, mortal inadequacies. Groomed in a church no longer hunted by Rome, Augustine made the startling discovery that human beings labored socially and spiritually under a debilitating state of peace. Internally, there was no war between the drives of reason and carnality, only a hateful compromise. If only it were that "spirit lusts against flesh and flesh against spirit"![4] Instead, modeling itself on the parent Adam, who had succumbed to Eve, the human spirit had acquiesced to the control of the flesh, relinquishing leadership in the interest of avoiding a power struggle. Human corruption was entire, beginning in the soul and manifesting itself in the bodily senses.[5] In the realms of society and politics, this acquiescence produced superficial understandings of community and promoted Christians' eagerness to deploy the Roman state's essential machinery of coercion for the wrong reasons. In response to the perils of these "Christian times," Augustine advocated a vision of earthly peacemaking that asked Christians to maintain conflict but sublimate it in self and society. Personal inner conflict to restore the rule of the spirit should be coupled with community policing, in which harshness was modulated by correct judgment.

By the end of the fourth century, the problem confronting Christian peace was not how to endure the presence of paganism but rather how to protect Christians against their own worst impulses: earthly desires, religious vainglory, hysteria about the end, and senseless conflict. Where once eschatology might have been a goad to action, it was now a danger. In times of peace, apocalyptic thinking could lead to the breakdown of law, order, and

4. Gal. 5.17.

5. For this reason, exegesis in the Augustinian tradition always stresses that flesh refers not to the body but to carnality or "tendencies of the flesh."

society, transforming pacifism and *patientia* into explicit warfare.[6] As Lactantius had described end times, "All justice will be confounded, and the laws will be destroyed. No one will then have anything except that which has been gained or defended by the hand: boldness and violence will possess all things."[7] In his own lifetime, Lactantius had seen these end times take shape, as Christian armies rose up to destroy pagan persecutors.

The world did not end; it married the Christian religion instead. And a century later, as if to mock the Christian triumph, imperial Christian Rome suffered defeats at the hands of barbarian clients: the Visigoths and Huns in Italy and the Vandals in North Africa. To many, especially in Augustine's North Africa, news of pagan victories must have seemed as if the end of time had arrived a hundred years too late. From his vantage point in Hippo Regius, Augustine denied the apocalypse by detaching Christian time from the time of Roman empire, locating it more broadly within a political, social, and spiritual condition that approximated the kingdom to come: Christian peace.[8]

In an inherently turbulent world, true peace could not be accurately assessed by the criteria of warfare and its cessation. Vandals, Visigoths, and Huns on the threshold of Roman territory reinforced Augustine's view that even when it professed a desire for order, pagan culture exemplified the innate violence of earthbound humanity.[9] The pagans loved peace, but their love of it was misguided, committed only to the production of a deceptive tranquility: "The imperial [pagan] city would impose not only its yoke but also its language on subjugated people through the peace of society . . . but with how many and great wars, with what slaughter of men and effusion of human blood has [such society] been brought together?"[10] On the other

---

6. Cf. a wide-ranging argument about the relationship between millenarianism and social upheaval in Norman Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium: Revolutionary Millenarians and Mystical Anarchists of the Middle Ages* (Fairlawn, NJ, 1957; repr., Oxford, 1970). See also the discussion of the Christian conceptual device of "partial fulfillment" that sustained the dichotomy of pacifism and bloodshed within post-Constantinian Christianity in Philippe Buc, "Some Thoughts on the Christian Theology of Violence, Medieval and Modern, from the Middle Ages to the French Revolution," *Rivista di storia del Christianesimo* 5.1 (2008): 9–28.

7. Lactantius, *The Divine Institutes* 7.15, trans. William Fletcher, ed. A. Roberts and J. Donaldson (Edinburgh, 1871), 463.

8. Cf. R. A. Markus, *Saeculum: History and Society in the Theology of St. Augustine*, rev. ed. (Cambridge, 1988), 45–104, which also grounds this assertion.

9. Daniel Baraz, *Medieval Cruelty: Changing Perceptions, Late Antiquity to the Early Modern Period* (Ithaca, NY, 2003), 35.

10 Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 19.7, ed. Emanuel Hoffmann, CSEL 40/2:383–384: "imperiosa civitas non solum iugum, verum etiam linguam suam domitis gentibus per pacem societatis inponeret . . . sed hoc quam multis et quam grandibus bellis, quanta strage hominum, quanta effusione humani sanguinis conparatum est?"

hand, coercive measures were permissible if true peace was the goal. After all, Christian peace must still make use of the world, its appointed leaders and laws, for the partial fulfillment of heavenly Jerusalem.[11]

But could coercive measures truly bring naysayers into a bond of Christian peace? For Augustine, to convert in a Christian sense meant to believe in Christ from the heart, something no one could do unwillingly.[12] Thus, although he wrote energetically against them, Augustine seems to have been reluctant at first to coerce the Donatists, fearing halfhearted, forced conversions. The evidence of his *Retractationes* shows how he resolved this problem after witnessing the successful application of force: this was not coercion but *disciplina*. As Peter Brown and Robert Markus have argued, Augustine's attitude to coercion evolved but within a "pre-determined" framework. Christianity could succeed only if it drew human beings, forcibly perhaps, as Paul of Tarsus had been drawn, but not necessarily against their will. As long as the goal was discipline, the transformation of desire, even secular remedies were permissible.[13] Thus, like Cyprian before him, Augustine adopted the image of prelate as physician, with one emendation: the pastor would have access to the repressive technology of the Roman government.

It was imperative therefore that Christian discipline be applied appropriately, and for this reason it must be properly understood. Peacemaking through discipline meant a reeducation of tastes and desires, that is to say, the cultivation of a discerning faculty that medieval authors would label as "discretion."[14] Consistent with the theology he was developing for a religion wedded to the world, Augustine insisted on the importance of physical sensation in the reception or rejection of peace. The senses provided the interface between world and self, and it was here that deception

11. Cf. Buc, "Christian Theology of Violence," 15–20.

12. Augustine, *In Iohannis evangelium tractatus* 26.3, ed. Augustine Meyer and R. Willems, CCSL 36:261 (henceforth *Tr. in J.*): "Si trahitur, ait aliquis, invitus venit. Si invitus venit, nec credit; si non credit, nec venit."

13. On Augustine's struggles with the question of coercion, see below and also Peter Brown, "Saint Augustine's Attitude to Religious Coercion," *Journal of Roman Studies* 54 (1964): 107–116; and Markus, *Saeculum*, 137–146.

14. On *disciplina*, see Oton Lottin, *Psychologie et morale aux XIIe et XIIIe siecles*, vol. 1, 2nd ed. (Gembloux, 1957); Jean Leclercq, "New Recruitment, New Psychology," in *Monks and Love in Twelfth-Century France: Psycho-historical Essays* (Oxford, 1979), 8–26; and Talal Asad, "On Discipline and Humility in Medieval Christian Monasticism," *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam* (Baltimore, 1993), 153–159. For Augustine's early notions of the purpose of discipline in a monastic community, see also Conrad Leyser, *Authority and Asceticism from Augustine to Gregory the Great* (Oxford, 2000), 10–11.

and betrayal of peace took place. Ordered pleasures liberated the will from violence.[15]

Disciplina referred to measures—gentle or forceful—that educated human tastes anew. Since all beings possessed and desired some version of peace, they often settled for poor imitations. Through their natural desire for peace, good and wicked persons, Christians and pagans, all wished to form communities and to follow some semblance of a social order. Even Lucifer's rebellion against the heavenly order had been a striving after peace:[16]

> In this way pride perversely mimics God. It hates to be equal with others under him but wants to replace its own dominance for his. It therefore hates the just peace of God, and loves its own iniquitous peace; [since] it cannot avoid loving peace of some kind.

The danger of misdirection became acute when lovers of false peace made it the basis of a false church. For Augustine, the true church came together through a confluence of rightly guided emotions. It could not be called peaceful if its members unthinkingly accepted the authority of their bishop. Even a sacrament conveyed within the ordered peace and communion of the church proved empty of benefit when those who accepted it did so without relishing the *pax*.[17] Before they could enjoy any lasting or beneficial harmony, there had to be an internal peace, established through the ordering of sensibilities.

Christ had said: "No one can come to me unless the Father who sent me draws him."[18] Augustine realized that the word "draw" (*trahere*) suggested that persons were pulled to the altar by violence, that is to say, against their will.[19] So it was important that Christians understood they should be drawn willingly, through an internal, emotional, and exclusive attachment.[20] The first draw was a common understanding of signs, not one single reading but rather readings that, even outside the intention of the earthly signifier (for example, the writer of sacred scripture), remained

---

15. We must be careful to read the term *liberum iudicium* not as "free will" but instead as "free decision." In the Augustinian tradition, free will is best equated with *bona voluntas* or "good will."

16. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 19.12, 375.

17. See chapter 4 above.

18. *Tr. in J.* 26.2, 260.

19. *Tr. in J.* 26.2, 260: "Si trahimur ad Christum, ergo inviti credimus; ergo *violentia* adhibetur, non voluntas excitatur."

20. *Tr. in J.* 26.3, 261: "nec motu corporis, sed voluntate cordis accedimus." (We do not accede by an action of the body but by the will of the heart.)

consistent with reason and faith.[21] Hence, the quality and manner of their understanding, the way that they read, brought people together in a community.[22] The second draw was even more basic: "I say, as much as one draws by the will, one also draws by pleasure (*voluptas*)."[23] Coming together in a Christian community required a transformation of desire.

Desire and understanding were coextensive. Augustine argued that the intellect (*animus*) experienced pleasure in the same way that the body did.[24] In his *Tractates on John's Gospel* he wrote:[25]

> There exists a certain pleasure of the heart to which bread that is heavenly is sweet . . . ; not through obligation but through delectation should we say that man is drawn to Christ; he who is delighted by truth, blessedness, justice, eternal life, all that is Christ. Indeed, can the senses of the body really have their desires, while the intellect is deprived of its own?

Augustine's discussions of the inner self cannot and should not be separated from his theology of government and social formation. A process of understanding that engaged the intellect through its own pleasures was the way to draw persons without compulsion to the Christian community. But why was it that so many persons were not drawn with pleasure to the altar? Why was it that so many people's pleasures drew them elsewhere, into the embrace of cults like the Manichees? Did their intellect desire differently, or was there some impediment to desire in the human being? Augustine's questions remain fundamental to any process of reimagining membership, obedience, and community.

Desire was impeded and misdirected in the self as an extension of the original human tragedy, a distortion of the cosmic peace embodied by the

---

21. Augustine deals with communities of signification in book 2 of *De doctrina Christiana*. See also Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram*, 1.18–1.19, ed. Joseph Zycha, CSEL 28/1:26–29. For a detailed discussion see R. A. Markus, *Signs and Meanings: World and Text in Ancient Christianity* (Liverpool, 1996), 105–120.

22. Markus, *Signs and Meanings*, 114–120.

23. *Tr. in J.* 26.4, 261: "Ego dico: parum est voluntate, etiam voluptate traheris."

24. *Tr. in J.* 26.4, 261: "Noli te cogitare invitum trahi; trahitur animus et amore." (Do not imagine yourself to be drawn unwillingly; the intellect is also drawn by pleasure.)

25. *Tr. in J.* 26.4, 261: "Est quedam voluptas cordis, cui panis dulcis est ille caelestis . . . non obligatio, sed delectatio, quanto fortius nos dicere debemus trahi hominem ad Christum, qui delectatur veritate, delectatur beatitudine, delectatur iustitia, delectatur sempiterna vita, quo totum Christus est? An vero habent corporis sensus voluptates suas, et animus deseritur a voluptatibus suis?"

first marriage. In his allegorical interpretation of Genesis, Augustine equated Adam and Eve's fall with an unnatural inversion of hierarchies, the rupture of a peaceful bond among themselves but also with God.[26] Adam fell because he disrupted a fundamental harmony, and the repercussions of his disruption extended from within the self to all of society and politics throughout time. The marriage of Adam and Eve is the Augustinian model for the relationship between reason and appetite. Desire must follow a specific sequence of command and obedience, one that was already accessible in the gender relationships of fourth-century Christian society. Marriage had been instituted as a sacrament because it represented this special, ordered relationship of rational and carnal motivations. It was the duty of reason to act in a "virile" manner, assert itself, and quell the desires presented to it by the appetite.[27] Thus the man commanded, and the woman obeyed.[28] If the sequence reversed itself, the home turned unhappy.[29] The ordered relationships of this happy home epitomized peace in the Augustinian tradition.

Eve's creation, her marriage to Adam, and the events of their expulsion expressed the predicament of a self—body and soul—that must mediate between reason and sensuality. She was special, representing not only such mediation as it occurred within an individual but also the interaction that took place among persons who inhabited a social, material, and political world. As she and Adam were made as one flesh, Eve displayed qualities "more evident in two persons, masculine and feminine."[30] As bone from his bone and flesh of his flesh, Eve represented not simply man's body but

---

26. Augustine, *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*, ed. Dorothea Weber, CSEL 91 (henceforth *DGM*).

27. *DGM* 2.14, 141–142: "Sed tamen per mulierem decipit: non enim etiam ratio nostra deduci ad consensionem peccati potest, nisi cum delectatio mota fuerit in illa parte animi, quae debet obtemperare rationi tanquam rectori viro." And *DGM* 2.11, 137: "Ad huius rei exemplum femina facta est, quam rerum ordo subiugat viro, ut, quod in duobus hominibus evidentius apparet, id est in masculo et femina, etiam in uno homine considerari possit: ut appetitum animae, per quem per membris corporis operamur, habeat mens interior tanquam virilis ratio subiugatum et iusta lege modum imponat adiutorio suo, sicut debet vir feminam regere nec eam permittere dominari in virum; quod ubi contingit, perversa et misera domum est."

28. *DGM* 2.17, 147.

29. *DGM* 2.11, 136–137: "Ad huius rei exemplum femina facta est, quam rerum ordo subiugat viro, ut, quod in duobus hominibus evidentius apparet, id est in masculo et femina, etiam in uno homine considerari possit: ut appetitum animae, per quem de membris corporis operamur, habeat mens interior tamquam virilis ratio subiugatum et iusta lege modum imponat adiutorio suo, sicut debet vir feminam regere nec eam permittere dominari in virum; quod ubi contingit, perversa et misera domus est."

30. *DGM* 2.11, 136: "femina facta est, . . . ut, quod in duobus hominibus evidentius apparet, id est in masculo et femina, etiam in uno homine considerari potest."

that part of him that engaged the world *through* the body.[31] She was the self when most closely in contact with worldly blandishments, the part that must directly combat stimuli to the external senses. This combat was encapsulated in the eternal struggle between woman and the serpent.[32] In this way, Eve (Hava) represents life, the occasion for evil and the place within persons where desire is aroused or dismissed, simultaneously a gateway to pollution and the proving ground for faith and forbearance.[33]

Culpability ensued once desire swayed reason, a process epitomized by the persuasion of Adam.[34] By succumbing, Adam abused what Augustine calls his "middle position" in the hierarchy of command.[35] Bad as it was to disobey his Maker, he made matters worse by saying: "The woman that you gave me as a companion tempted me."[36] So Adam not only sinned by accusing God of engineering his temptation; he also "unmanned" himself: by saying Eve had persuaded him, he admitted to a reversal of the correct sequence of command. The pattern was set for human mortality: not just death but the inability of the spirit to exert itself over flesh. To make matters worse, the unredeemed soul would not only suffer the unjust rule of carnality over reason, but it would positively revel in it. It would refuse even to fight the inversion of rule, settling instead for quietude and complicity—false peace.

In such a situation, only a shock could restore the senses long enough for human beings to sense the complete horror of their condition. As a punishment

---

31. *DGM* 2.1, 117.

32. *DGM* 2.18, 151: "Quare ergo ita dicitur, nisi quia hic manifeste ostenditur non posse nos a diabolo temptari nisi per illam animalem partem, quae quasi mulieris imaginem vel exemplum in ipso uno homine ostendit, de qua superius multa iam diximus?" (Therefore, why is it said in this way [that God will place enmity between the serpent and the woman], unless because it is manifestly demonstrated in this that it is not possible for us to be tempted by the devil unless through the animal part—which is like the image and example of the woman revealed within one single person, regarding which we have said so much above.)

33. *DGM* 2.11,136: "Adhuc enim erat quod fieret, ut non solum anima corpori dominaretur, quia corpus servilem locum obtinet, sed etiam virilis ratio subiugaret sibi animalem partem sua, per quod adiutorium imperat corpori. Ad huius rei exemplum femina facta est, quam rerum ordo subiugat viro." (For it still remained to be done that not only should the spirit dominate the body, since the body takes the servile position, but also that virile reason should subjugate to itself its animal part, through whose assistance it might command the body. As an example of this condition, the woman was made, whom the man subjugates in the order of events.)

34. *DGM* 2.14, 142: "Sed tamen per mulierem decipit: non enim etiam ratio nostra deduci ad consensionem peccati postest, nisi cum delectatio mota fuerit in illa parte animi, quae debet obtemperare rationi tamquam rectori viro."

35. *DGM* 2.15, 144.

36. Gen. 1.10.

for her part in the temptation of Adam, Eve must bear children in pain, just as painful struggle against worldly desires would eventually bear spiritual fruit. Only after this spiritual birthing would the appetite once more obey reason, its husband.[37] Humanity's abjectness, its propensity for anger and its inability to understand, broke down man's complacency, laying him open, "convalescent," to divine mercy.[38] The mortal body wrapped around human beings mocked a captive soul through its sicknesses and needs. So too did the Roman state, the political condition, hold up an imperfect earthly church to ridicule. Far from casting these aside, the work of redemption was to endure the mortal coil and treat it as an entryway to the reception of divine grace.

Mortality distorted all things intended for human benefit: government, friendship, and most importantly, peace. "Peace is an uncertain boon," says Augustine, "since we do not know the hearts of those with whom we wish to maintain it, and even if we could know today, we would be equally unaware tomorrow."[39] This inability to know the hearts of those closest created anxieties regarding every aspect of social life, including the validity of a church's sacraments and the legitimacy of earthly rulers.

Read in the vocabulary of peace discussed so far, the inner being was in a state of violence but not war. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the inherent violence of the mortal condition presented extreme challenges, blinding Christians when they had to choose, for example, between two competing and equally valid claims to sovereignty: papacy and empire. To combat such blindness, intellectuals developed models of forceful resistance and internal peacemaking. They began, as Augustine had, with the text of Genesis.

---

37. *DGM* 2.21, 153–154. While Christian exegetes beginning with Paul had read Eve's creation from Adam's side as an acknowledgment of woman's subservience to man, the Augustinian exegesis took such subservience for granted. Instead of expounding the biblical passage to justify woman's inferior place in society or politics, Augustine assumes knowledge of that subordinate position in order to explore the meaning of Eve's relationship to Adam. Cf. 1 Cor. 11 and 1 Tim. 2.

38. This is a key difference between Augustine and the Greek fathers, Origen, Athanasius, and others who insisted that an individual could through his or her own purity envision lost divinity and recover the image of the Father. G. B. Ladner, *The Idea of Reform: Its Impact on Christian Thought and Action in the Age of the Fathers*, rev ed. (New York, 1967), 83–107. In the Latin tradition, while displaying a slightly greater optimism than Augustine regarding the individual's potential for amelioration, Gregory the Great followed the bishop of Hippo's general argument. The human spirit itself was so feeble and twisted that the burden of faith placed on it must be graduated, and the rest left up to God's grace. Robert Markus attributes to this convalescence the birth of Christian universalism, a church for the strong and the weak in faith. The church's embrace of human weakness marks the "end of ancient Christianity." Markus, *The End of Ancient Christianity* (Cambridge, 1990). See also Leyser, *Authority and Asceticism*, 26–28.

39. Augustine, *De civ.* 19.5, 363, and quoting Matthew 10.36: "A man's foes are those of his own household."

Genesis as a Pattern for Reform

In the late eleventh century, exegetical readings of Genesis provided patterns for reform, describing self and society in an original state to which humanity must return and through such return be elevated.[40] One such exegete, Peter Damian, expounded on the disciplining of self, modeled on the first seven days of the world. A hermit and cardinal-bishop of Ostia who died in 1072 before the conflict between papacy and empire had reached a climax, Damian straddled the active and contemplative modes with a balance usually only exhibited by the abbots of the great house of Cluny. Peter served the papacy of Leo IX and acted as a voice of restraint against the more ambitious flights of papal counselors like Humbert of Silva Candida. He debated the rigorist Humbert on the objective validity of the sacraments of simoniac priests. Known for his dislike of political office, he only reluctantly took the position at Ostia and mischievously called the ambitious Hildebrand (future Gregory VII) his "holy Satan."[41]

Owing to Damian's studied disparagement of the papacy's secular concerns, historians often consign him and his theological descendants to the category of "mystic," as if mysticism completely removed the author from surrounding events. In the Middle Ages, however, withdrawal from the world was very much a public act. Scholars withdrew to monasteries in much the same way that knights withdrew to their castles, as an overt sign of defiance or displeasure with prevailing conditions at the center.[42] Alger of Liège followed a popular example and retired to Cluny after an active life in the service of his bishop, Otbert, a friend, client and, ultimately, protector of King Henry IV of Germany. William of Saint-Thierry retired to the Cistercian order in much the same way, and his fellow Cistercian Isaac of Stella confined himself to an island after a turbulent career mediating between King Henry II of England and Thomas Becket. The Arthurian prose *Quest of the Holy Grail*, possibly authored by Cistercians, emphasizes the degree to which lost knights relied on hermits to reacquaint them (and the work's audience) with the state of affairs, both moral and political. Richard the Lionhearted

40. Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram* 6.20, 194; Ladner, *Idea of Reform*, 154–156.

41. Peter Damian, *Epistola* 57, in *Die Briefe des Petrus Damiani*, vol. 2, ed. K. Reindel, MGH Epp 2:167.

42. William of Champeaux began the Abbey of Saint-Victor after the public act of withdrawing from his position at the school of Laon. The Cistercian founders, Robert of Molesme and Stephen Harding, similarly promoted this trope of active withdrawal as a means of instigating reform.

visited the most famous Cistercian recluse, Joachim of Fiore, to receive perspectives on his Crusade campaign.[43] Damian himself was no stranger to political conflict, having served his time as a papal legate. He represented the papacy in Milan during the uprising of the Pataria, taking a position against the rebels in opposition to Archdeacon Hildebrand.[44] In 1067, he mediated between the bishop of Florence and an uprising of monks and commoners.[45] For his visions of reform, Damian resorted to an allegory of the interior, not to escape worldly politics entirely but rather to approach it with the proper perspective.

Although called to the curia only during Pope Leo's tenure, Damian had witnessed the earliest years of papal reform and the deliberate foundation of a new Roman church under Emperor Henry III and Pope Clement II on Christmas Day 1046. From his hermitage at Fonte Avellana, Damian had shown considerable interest in the disputed papal elections of the 1040s. He applauded when the reform-minded John Gratian was appointed Pope Gregory VI, and supported his desire to rid the church of simony.[46] When Gregory resigned his office in disgrace, Henry installed Suidger of Bamberg, who took the name Clement II. As Herbert Cowdrey has pointed out, to take the name of Saint Peter's successor was a signal of a new beginning for the church in Rome.[47] Damian watched as Clement crowned Henry emperor; he gave his support as the pope also named the emperor *patricius*, or protector of Rome. That Henry asked for the hermit's support alongside that of Odilo, the powerful abbot of Cluny, suggests that Damian's approval carried considerable weight.[48] Thus, when Leo took office in 1049, he had for an adviser not simply a paragon of piety but a highly respected elder statesman who had had considerable experience of reform.

---

43. We might contrast the scholarly high medieval recluse to the creature of direct divine revelations and eroded classical communitarian institutions in Peter Brown, "The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity," *Journal of Roman Studies* 61 (1971): 80–101.

44. Peter Damian, *Ep.* 65, 236–240.

45. H. E. J. Cowdrey, *Gregory VII, 1073–1085* (Oxford, 1998), 67.

46. Damian, *Ep.* 72, 326–366. Damian also reports on Gregory's subsequent fall. The pope had opposed King Henry's coronation as emperor on the grounds of his incestuous marriage to Agnes of Poitou. Revelations that Gregory's supporters had bought his election as pope made the old man vulnerable to a monarch who had little reason to protect him. Gregory was deposed, transported to Germany, and then sent into exile, accompanied by the monk Hildebrand. Cowdrey, *Gregory VII*, 22–24. Jean Leclercq, *Saint Pierre Damien, ermite et homme d'église* (Rome, 1960), 64–65.

47. Cowdrey, *Gregory VII*, 23.

48. Ibid., 23–24.

Despite his association with Leo, Peter often found himself opposing the pope's fellow Lotharingians Humbert and Bishop Wazo of Liège, who veered toward anti-imperial radicalism. The late Wazo had long criticized Emperor Henry's interference in papal elections, and it is likely that Damian proved crucial in maintaining a balanced relationship between the new pope and the emperor.[49] While Wazo pointed to canon law as the reason for his objections, Damian urged a more fundamental principle: peace, the cornerstone of concord between *regnum* and *sacerdotium*.

As the pope and his advisers pursued legislative reforms, Damian looked inward, adopting the approach of Saint Gregory the Great, one of several paradigms for the papal reform.[50] Confronted by growing militancy in the curia, Damian revisited relationships between spirit and flesh in order to describe the formation of a moral order within the church. The fundamental zone of conflict was interior: "contestations of the inner life" (as one scholar puts it) then structured communication between the internal and external spheres.[51] Damian's commentary of Genesis captures his certitude that peace meant the hegemony of spirit over flesh. Attempts at reform through force would prove useless without an adequate internal transformation modeled on creation.

Damian's moral, allegorical exegesis of Genesis may also be placed within what Karl Morrison has called "the mimetic tradition of reform."[52] As he is a microcosm, the mundane condition of man imitates the corporeal nature of the world, both of them striving toward a perfection that can happen only through a process of augmentation.[53] Light, representing faith, marks the beginning of this augmentation.[54] The division of waters is the division of believers and nonbelievers but also of spiritual and carnal impulses.[55] Subsequently, the third day marks a more minute division, as persons reject

---

49. On Wazo's objections to Henry's interference, see Ute-Renate Blumenthal, *The Investiture Controversy: Church and Monarchy from the Ninth to the Twelfth Century* (Philadelphia, 1988), 87.

50. See Leclercq, *Pierre Damien*, 80–84, for more on Damian's relationship with other reformers in Leo's court, and 111–117, on tensions with Hildebrand during the papacy of Alexander II.

51. Ineke van 't Spijker, *Fictions of the Inner Life: Religious Literature and the Formation of the Self in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Turnhout, 2004), 25.

52. Karl F. Morrison, *The Mimetic Tradition of Reform in the West* (Princeton, NJ, 1982), 69 and 121–161.

53. Peter Damian, *Expositio mystica historiarum libri Geneseos*, *PL* 145:841B (henceforth *Mystica*).

54 Damian, *Mystica*, 841B-C: "Tunc autem in homine dicitur ut fiat lux, cum datur ei ut illuminatio sibi credulitatis infulgeat; prima quippe mentis lux fides est."

55 Damian, *Mystica*, 841C-D: "Cum igitur homo per firmamentum, hoc est, per coelestis eloquii documentum, jam incipit dividere inferiores aquas a superioribus, id est, carnalia a spiritualibus, terrena a coelestibus separare."

the saline waters of carnality to thirst like the dry land for the spring of divine grace.[56] The stages of creation map how "man may be consummated and how he should be perfected."[57] Man's creation initiated a day of rest, typifying the quietude attained by the redemptive process: "God became the Sabbath of man and man became the Sabbath of God."[58] A dominant characteristic of becoming God's image is complete identity between spirit and flesh, witnessed on earth only in the Eucharist. Such identity between the two marks the end of any conflict or domination. Unable to match such perfection, human beings may only approximate and learn from it.[59] The sixth day, on which man was created to the image and similitude of his Creator, thus prefigures the sacrament of "inmost renewal."[60]

Although he died before matters came to a head between Pope Gregory and King Henry IV, Damian asserted an important criterion for rulership: discernment. Man had become monarch of all creatures only because he was able to demonstrate correct judgment.[61] Such judgment could take place only in a being whose reason had trumped carnal impulses. It was left to other scholars to determine who was capable of exercising such discernment: king or pope, layman or cleric, prince or scholar. Genesis again offered up answers.

Unlike Damian, who read the Sabbath as a type for inner pacification, Bruno of Segni (d. 1125) read Genesis, and especially the seventh day, as a lesson on how the priestly order inaugurates the peace of the church. Bruno received his education in a Benedictine monastery before becoming a canon and later bishop of a diocese on the outskirts of Rome. He may have learned political allegorical techniques from Damian's works, and under the tutelage

56. Damian, *Mystica*, 842C: "Facta igitur divisione aquarum, hoc est, inter terrena et coelestia, necesse est ut humana mens haec eadem terrena minutius dividat, et sic reprobos homines, huius terrenae sapientiae salsugine prurientes, a justis, fontem fidei sitientibus, tanquam ab arida mare, discernat."

57. Damian, *Mystica*, 841B: "qualiter valeat homo consummari et quomodo debeat perfici."

58. Damian, *Mystica*, 843D: "Hoc itaque modo et homo fit Dei Sabbatum, et Deus Sabbatum hominis fit, quia ipse homo in Deo requiescit, et Deus in eo."

59. Damian, *Mystica*, 843A-B: "Differentia quippe magna erat inter Paulum, qui Christum imitabatur, et eos quos provocabat ad imitandum seipsum, dicens: 'imitatores mei estote, sicut et ego Christi.'" Paul is better able to imitate Christ than his listeners are; hence they imitate Paul.

60. Damian, *Mystica*, 843B: "Quod utique sicut tunc factum est per humanae conditionis exordium, ita nunc agitur per instaurationis intimae *sacramentum*."

61. Damian, *Mystica*, 843B-C.

of the exegete's nephew.[62] More explicitly than Damian, Bruno supported papal claims in polemical debates regarding who should have ultimate command over the church on earth.[63] He attended Pope Urban II's council at Clermont in 1095, where the pontiff declared a general truce among Christians and called for a crusade to the Holy Land. Although he should be considered primarily a scriptural exegete, the tone of Bruno's Genesis commentary fits a body of work that included tracts against simony, a hagiographical treatment of Pope Leo IX, and an admonition to Pope Paschal II against compromise with the German emperor. In that sense he provided an important intellectual component of Gregory VII's political program, joining a reform *curia* that included canonists and controversialists.[64]

Bruno regarded Genesis as the pattern for an apostolic church: exclusively clerical and supervised by Peter's successors in the new Jerusalem at Rome. Christ lived and ruled only in this vision of peace, the construction of which demanded insurrection: the destruction of older entanglements and the formation of new fidelities.[65] "Such a peace is there in the Church of God," says Bruno. "Such a peace is there in men of good will."[66] Persons of bad will (*malae voluntatis*) were prohibited from peace, since, as Isaiah had said, "there is no peace for the wicked" (Isa. 68.22). For this reason, the irrational beasts—heretics and philosophers—were unable to have peace, as such creatures "rejoice in blood and are fed by credulity."[67]

---

62. Ian S. Robinson, "'Political Allegory' in the Biblical Exegesis of Bruno of Segni," *RTAM* 50 (1983): 84–85: "It is quite possible that the later eleventh-century papal polemicists learned the technique of political allegory from Peter Damian. It is in fact possible to trace a connection with Peter Damian in the *Commentarium in Isaiam* of Bruno of Segni."

63. For the relationship between politics and theology in the work of Bruno, see Robinson, "Biblical Exegesis of Bruno of Segni," 69–98; and William North, "In the Shadows of Reform: Exegesis and the Formation of a Clerical Elite in the Works of Bruno, Bishop of Segni (1078/9–1123)" (PhD diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1998).

64. William North, "Polemic, Apathy, Authorial Initiative in Gregorian Rome: The Curious Case of Bruno of Segni," *Haskins Society Journal* 10 (2001): 113–125, depicts this reformist circle as relatively informal yet closely attentive to Gregory's desire for multiple genres of textual support; Bruno's intellectual attainments earned him an important place in this group.

65. Bruno of Segni, *Sententiae* 2.7, PL 165:923B.

66. Bruno, *Sententiae* 2.7, 922D-923A: "Talis *pax* in Ecclesia Dei est: talis *pax* est hominibus bonae voluntatis."

67. Bruno, *Sententiae* 2.7, 923A: "Bestiae pacem habere non possunt, quae sanguine gaudent et credulitate nutriuntur." Despite credible suggestions made to me that the penultimate word in this sentence may in fact be *crudelitat*e (on cruelty), "credulity" in fact makes more sense, given that Bruno then goes on to decry mistaken belief.

Based on Genesis, Bruno's ruling order is a spiritual, apostolic, and intellectual order. The separation of darkness from light, the creation of the firmament, and the formation of man prefigure the introduction of scripture into a pagan world, the creation of ecclesiastical offices, and the correct assignment of authoritative relationships.[68] The empty earth is the church before the understanding of scripture. Dividing light from darkness marks the separation of faithful and heretics.[69] The sun stands for the New Testament of the spirit, and the moon is the Old Testament, which, engulfed in clouds, pallidly reflects that spirit through law.[70] Represented by stars in the firmament, the apostles are privy to arcane, celestial knowledge not directly vouchsafed to other human beings.[71]

In this design, the clergy achieve leadership through imitation of God.[72] They teach, but they also punish: in the story of the Fall, the cherubim with the flaming sword typify "the apostles, and the *doctores* of the church, in whom treasures of wisdom and knowledge are stored."[73] They wield the sword to separate sinners (both paupers and magnates) from participation in the flesh of Christ, by interdict or excommunication.[74] A Cyprianist design, this clerical reform program also reflected the aspirations of Bruno's friend and patron, Pope Gregory VII, who regularly wielded the flaming sword, and cursed those who withheld it in the name of peace.[75]

---

68. Bruno of Segni, *Expositio in Genesim*, PL 164:150B-D: "At this point the earth was indeed void and empty, at this point also was the church infertile and free . . . but why was it void and empty? Since at this point darkness was on the face of the earth. Indeed no one understood the Scriptures, hence the depths and darknesses of ignorance that some are able to understand, 'deep calls to deep' [Ps. 41.8]. Christ removed this darkness when he assigned sense to the apostles, so that they understood the Scriptures."

69. Bruno, *Expositio*, 151A.

70. Bruno, *Expositio*, 154A-B.

71. Bruno, *Expositio*, 151D-152A.

72. Bruno, *Expositio*, 158B-D. "Since they have the similitude of God, they are all venerated as if superior," says Bruno. "The Apostle [Paul] also had the similitude of God [when he] said: 'Be my imitators just as I am the imitator of Christ.'" Bruno, *Expositio*, 158B: "Nam quia Dei similitudinem habent, ideo quasi superiores omnes eos venerantur. Dei namque similitudinem Apostolus habebat, qui dicebat: 'Imitatores mei estote, sicut et ego Christi'" (Phil. 3.17).

73. Bruno, *Expositio*, 171C: "Cherubim . . . significat autem apostolos, Ecclesiaque doctores, in quibus sapientiae et scientiae thesauri reconditi sunt."

74. Bruno, *Expositio*, 171C: "Cum autem propter peccatum suum aliquis de paradiso, id est de Sancta Ecclesia, ejicitur, ne ad lignum vitae, id est ad Christi carnem participandam, accedere presumat, ab iis interdicitur. Est autem iste Gladius lucens . . . est autem et versatilis facilisque et velox ad feriendum, undique circa se delinquentes percutit pauperes pariter condemnat et divites."

75 Cf. Jer. 48.10. See above, chapter 2.

For Bruno true peace in the church came not from illumination but from constant conflict. The church must wage war against the devil, manifested in institutional life as disobedience, invasion of holy office, and unjust domination. For this reason God said to the serpent: "I put enmity between you and the woman." The seed of man and devil fought eternally "because those thinking different things, desiring different things, seeking different things, can on no account have peace and concord between themselves."[76] Christ's blood, prefigured in the blood of Abel that called from the earth, would be the daily reminder of this conflict.[77] Submission, weakness, even tranquility, were untenable. Only the Jews, protected by the mark of Cain, enjoyed freedom from conflict: not because they had achieved peace, but because they were the most subjugated of all people, condemned to wander everywhere without a home.[78]

Exegesis as Discipline

Twelfth-century theologies of peace exhibit a combination of the contrasting attitudes toward reform epitomized by Peter Damian and Bruno of Segni. They emphasize interior transformation as a precondition for political and social action but also place great emphasis on the use of force, a convulsive shock to a complacent system. Internal peacemaking required tumult to liberate the soul from its conspiracy with the flesh. The human self was a kingdom over which reason and carnality fought; the body was merely an obedient servant, obliged to support the victor. A healthy emotional tumult provided the "germ of wisdom" that, once instigated, would direct the self's pursuit of blessed silence.[79]

If the faithful wanted an illustration of disciplinary turbulence, they need only regard the mortal fear in which Jesus gave up his own life. Around 1110, the Lotharingian monk Rupert of Deutz described Christ's passion as the moment when the human will of the Son of God submitted to the

76. Bruno, *Expositio*, 169D: "Sunt autem inimicitiae inter diabolum et Ecclesiam, quae quidem per mulierem significatur, et inter semen et filios utriusque, quia diversa sentientes, diversa cupientes, diversa sectantes, nunquam pacem et concordiam inter se habere possunt."

77. Bruno, *Expositio*, 172D–173B. This tripartite exegesis foreshadows the approach of Joachim of Fiore.

78. Bruno, *Expositio*, 174B. The events of the First Crusade undercut Bruno's interpretation.

79. Hugh of Saint-Victor, *De archa Noe* 3.2, ed. P. Sicard, CCCM 176:55: "Primo igitur ibi de sapientia dictum est quod per timorem seminatur" (cf. Prov. 1.7).

divine will.[80] In a conversation between the Father and the Son, Jesus sought to escape the death of the body. "Let this cup pass from me," he pleaded, fearing the moment of death, as every human does when flesh and spirit face the prospect of separation.[81] Ultimately, the Son submitted to his Father, saying: "Not my but your will be done." In this exemplary act of obedience, the human Christ took into his heart the divine will, dying as part of God's plan for salvation. In the final moments, Jesus's external senses, his mortal flesh, cried out, yearning for immortality, while at the same time, his spirit commended itself to the Father's embrace.[82]

For Rupert and fellow *doctores*, the Savior's death provided humanity with a pattern of peacemaking that applied to their own intellectual struggles, the manner in which all human beings should respond to the visible signs of invisible grace. Through a tempestuous internal bifurcation, a revolution of the senses, the conspiracy of spirit and flesh would be broken in fallen humanity. The flesh followed its nature in grieving its own mortality and seeking eternal life.[83] At the same time, the spirit broke its conspiracy with the flesh by turning toward the Father and ultimately finding new sources of delight. In human beings this emotional rending, generally experienced only at death, produced complete clarity of discernment because carnality and reason no longer trespassed on one another's territory.[84] Ideally, the exegetical process should follow the same pattern.

In the early twelfth century the discipline of biblical exegesis had what Beryl Smalley identifies as two loci: the monastery and the secular schools.[85] Exegetes

---

80. Rupert of Deutz, *De victoria Verbi Dei* 12.17, ed. Rhaban Haacke, MGH Quellen 5:390–391.

81. It is important to remember that strictly speaking, the spirit and flesh of the Lord cannot be separated. However, Jesus experienced mortal fear just as any human being would. Moreover, in *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 38, Augustine claims that as he was dying, Christ took into himself the person of Adam. It is Adam, therefore, who cries out at the last instance that God has forsaken him, a recapitulation of the initial transgression when Adam forsook God.

82. Rupert, *De victoria* 12.17, 390: "Humanitas quippe gustum mortis naturaliter pavebat et refugiebat, et naurali corporis amore anima tenebatur et in carne manere volebat. Porro divinitas rationabili iudicio aliud intendebat, scilicet quod ad salutem generis humani necessarium erat, et eius natur(a)e voluntatem su(a)e voluntati humanitas preferebat, dum in oratione sua premisso: *Mi pater, si possibile est, non sicut transeat a me calix iste*, continue subiunxit: *Verumtamen non sicut ego volo, sed sicut tu*."

83. Rupert says that Christ's last words, "Heli, heli, lema zapthani," mean "O the plenitude of all divinity who lives in me physically, why do you constrain yourself inside, why do you remain silent as I die?" See *De victoria* 12.17, 390.

84. Hugh of Saint-Victor describes in detail the impact of external tribulation on internal clarity. *Archa* 3.11, 4.4, and 4.8.

85. Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1983; orig. 1952), 37–46, on the Carolingian tradition and the monastic schools, and 46–66, on the *Glossa ordinaria*, largely a product of the cathedral schools.

trained in the schools especially emphasized struggle with the mysteries of the letter, a method that Saint Augustine had demonstrated in his *De Genesi ad litteram*. Yet while monastic and scholastic aims differed, there was much overlap among the practitioners (who might start their career as monks and end as seculars or vice versa) and in the general exegetical approach. Before the period under discussion, cloistered exegetes had privileged allegory in the manner of Origen and used the contemplative digressions in Gregory the Great's *Moralia in Job* as a standard for the moral exposition of scripture; by the twelfth century, they engaged more with literal conundrums, in a manner not very different from seculars. Exegesis had become a form of disciplining, an exportation of the monastic training of senses and desires to a general ascent from the letter to the spirit.[86]

Augustine compared human grasp of the mysteries of sacred text to a man watching the sunset. His mortal vision would first take in the foreground, then some trees, perhaps a cliff, boats on the horizon, and finally the sun itself, even though the sun was there from the start. In the same way, although creation took place in an instant, in a manner that transcended time, the human imagination locked in temporality could understand it only as a progression: six days.[87] Grappling on three occasions with the mystery of creation, Augustine insisted that the literal sense of scripture needed expounding as much as the moral sense. In the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries, this hermeneutic imperative trumped the allegorical one, and a discipline of exegetical commentary became part of the process by which humanity came to perceive, understand, and appreciate its redemption.[88]

The Schools and the *Ordinary Gloss*

The cathedral schools had initially developed in the tenth century as a means of education for future statesmen, not for monks or those men who "spoke to a very few," and in their early twelfth-century incarnation they retained

86. It is possible to overstate distinctions between "monastic" and "scholastic" exegesis. Like Smalley, Guy Lobrichon, *La Bible au Moyen Âge* (Paris, 2003), 22–23 and 64–67, describes an increased emphasis on mysteries of the letter (as opposed to moral allegory) with the advent of the schools in the late eleventh century, but he blurs the distinctions even further. As Lobrichon points out, the great innovation of scholastic exegesis was the development of the historical sense under Master Anselm of Laon, an approach attuned toward a broader audience than the cloister, but Cistercians like Bernard of Clairvaux developed the same sense of scripture in their sermons. (It is also worth remembering that exegetical recourse to history, past and future, reached its apogee in a monk and recluse, Joachim of Fiore.)

87. Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram* 4.2–4.7, 96–103.

88. Smalley, *Study of the Bible*; see note 85 above.

some traces of their original goals. The schools emerged in Lotharingia, consonant with the activities of powerful reforming bishops, and were driven by the Ottonian dichotomy of pastor as imperial prince.[89] As Stephen Jaeger describes in his study of the Ottonian schools, the exemplary personality of the teacher formed an essential part of the education, as did the application of the liberal arts to cultivate natural leadership abilities. The eleventh-century authors who lauded the teaching of the schools noted that these qualities included humility and discretion.[90] The cultivation of virtue in these schools served the needs of Ottonian courtly culture, but by the second half of the eleventh century, discretion had become its own reward.

As the schools evolved, so did the landscape around them; the cathedrals and diocesan palaces became town centers and marketplaces. The late eleventh- and early twelfth-century urban schools, daughters of Liège and Chartres, bear little resemblance to the Ottonian hothouses of empire, save in their organization around a charismatic master. The students went on to become scholars in their own right, or like their teachers, servants of a city cathedral, canons, or perhaps bishops. They came from middling rural and urban families, not from imperial nobility.

While the cultivation of discretion had remained an important scholastic goal, for its attainment the masters were turning not only to the classical *trivium* but also to exegesis. The later eleventh century saw the reinvigoration of Carolingian scriptural commentary in the schools of Laon, Auxerre, and eventually Paris. At Laon, the schoolmaster Anselm and his brother Ralph embarked on a project of "glossing" the Bible. While the *Glossa ordinaria* (Ordinary Gloss) had no single author as such, it was compiled under Anselm's authority, and completed by a small circle of his students, relatives, and colleagues.[91] The final form retained the basic Anselmian

89. C. Stephen Jaeger, *The Envy of Angels: Cathedral Schools and Social Ideals in Medieval Europe, 950–1200* (Philadelphia, 1994), 36–52.

90. Jaeger, *Envy of Angels*, 42, on Sigebert of Gembloux's *vita* of Dietrich of Metz: Dietrich learned through the *humili et discreta praelatione* of his exemplar, Bruno of Cologne. Jaeger suggests Bruno's court at Cologne provided the exemplar for the earliest schools at Liège, Rheims, and later Chartres. (The connection to Chartres is at best indirect.)

91. Smalley, *Study of the Bible*, 61: "The interesting point is that twelfth-century writers themselves had conflicting ideas on the compilers of the different parts of the gloss, only knowing that they were connected with Anselm." For an account of the project in its first iterations, see Smalley, *Study of the Bible*, 63; and Lesley Smith, *The "Glossa ordinaria": The Making of a Medieval Bible Commentary* (Leiden, 2009), esp. 17–38 and 141–145. Guy Lobrichon, "Une nouveauté: Les gloses de la Bible," in *Le Moyen Âge et la Bible*, ed. Pierre Riché and Guy Lobrichon, Bible de Tous les Temps 4 (Paris, 1984), 103–108, describes inconsistent beginnings in the first quarter of the twelfth century before the work reached Paris.

approach. Generally praised (except by his student Abelard) for a combination of discretion, dignity, and acuity, Anselm exemplified the aims of the exercise: not to produce a scriptural reference book but rather to cultivate and canonize the discretion of centuries as it applied to the sacred page.[92] Misunderstood as a grammatical exercise by traditionalists like Rupert of Deutz and Bernard of Clairvaux, the *Ordinary Gloss* was indispensable to scholastics after 1140, and especially after Peter Lombard and Gilbert de la Porrée reworked and helped stabilize the format.[93] By 1137 there were copies in Paris of several glosses from Laon, and it is possible to speak of a standardized and generally accepted *Gloss* by the middle of the century.[94] The gloss format became influential in its own right and even adorned display Bibles.[95] The *Gloss* therefore provides an important source for attitudes toward authority, obedience, and the basis of all community in the first half of the twelfth century.[96]

To "gloss" meant to make a text speak: in other words, to make it available to the limited human sensibilities.[97] It was a technique by which Anselm trained his students: they would assemble his oral lessons on a scriptural text into a commentary (*glosule*). For his Bible project, Anselm took the same approach, using as his "teachers" patristic commentators generally mediated by Carolingian intellectuals like Hrabanus Maurus.[98] While Carolingian literary textbooks, psalters, and (a few and precious) manuscripts of scriptural commentary used the "gloss" format, most exegesis would have taken a "lemmatic" form, which meant a scriptural passage would then be followed

92. On the master's charisma and Abelard's derision of Anselm, see Jaeger, *Envy of Angels*, 81. See also Guibert's praise of Anselm in *Monodies*, discussed below, in note 131.

93. Smith, *Making of a Medieval Bible Commentary*, 10, 75–79.

94. Smalley, *Study of the Bible*, 65. As Smalley does, I will use "Gloss" when referring to the *Glossa ordinaria* as a whole and "gloss" when referring to a particular portion. Guy Lobrichon meanwhile has suggested that the term *Glossa ordinaria* should apply only to versions after about 1220 ("Une nouveauté," 101–102).

95. A Bible commissioned for Cluny is typical of an early thirteenth-century glossed Bible: BnF N.A.L. 2245 (henceforth Gloss A). The text is paginated and will be referred to by page number, not by folio. For a further description, see below, note 107.

96. See Philippe Buc, *L'ambiguïté du livre: Prince, pouvoir, et peuple dans les commentaires de la Bible au Moyen Âge* (Paris, 1994).

97. *Gloss* derives from the Greek word for "tongue." Lobrichon, "Une nouveauté," 96–97; Smith, *Making of a Medieval Bible Commentary*, 1.

98. Smith, *Making of a Medieval Bible Commentary*, 5–8, and on the glossators' sources, 41–56. Lobrichon cites Lanfranc of Bec, Berengar of Tours, Drogo of Paris, and Bruno of Chartres as influences around Laon, where Anselm developed his cathedral school at the end of the eleventh century.

by a lengthy exposition.[99] Anselm, who had worked with both formats, now envisaged a continuous scriptural text with marginal and interlinear commentary. Apparently intending to gloss the whole Bible himself (although contemporaneous collaborations suggest otherwise), Anselm died in 1117 after having prepared glosses on Psalms, the Pauline epistles, and possibly the Gospel of John. His brother compiled the glosses on Matthew, Luke, and possibly the minor prophets.[100] Gilbert of Auxerre, surnamed "the Universal," seems to have undertaken the bulk of the compilation—signing his contributions in the process—including the gloss on Genesis.[101] The gloss on Genesis therefore conveys certain shared attitudes toward peacemaking between reason and carnality, which are largely indebted to Augustine. Anselm developed these notions of inner peace further in commentaries on the "good will," where, as we will see, he proposed that all human beings existed on a spectrum between blessed and wicked peace.

Concord and Coercion in the *Ordinary Gloss*

The general format for a fully evolved, high medieval gloss is three columns, two large columns of commentary with a column of scripture inserted in between.[102] The two outer columns are now called marginal gloss, although this may be a misnomer.[103] Selections of patristic commentary on the relevant biblical passages are placed here. Between the lines of scripture is a further, "interlinear gloss." This sometimes spills over into one of the outer columns, in which case it can be read similarly to the marginal gloss.[104] On most pages,

99. Smith, *Making of a Medieval Bible Commentary*, 91–92.

100. Smith, *Making of a Medieval Bible Commentary*, 32–33, provides a helpful list of suggested attributions.

101. See Smalley, *Study of the Bible*, 62 and 66.

102. For an explanation and diagrams of successive layouts of the biblical gloss, see Christopher de Hamel, *Glossed Books of the Bible and the Origins of the Paris Booktrade* (Woodbridge, UK, 1984), 14–27; and Smith, *Making of a Medieval Bible Commentary*, 91–139.

103. Rather than a Bible with marginal commentary, the format often produces a two-column collection of commentaries with scripture inserted almost as an afterthought. Richly decorated with gold, red, and blue uncials, BnF N.A.L. 2245 is one such text and quite large (16″ x 12″), giving over most of the space to the gloss. The biblical text is in large script but cramped into a tiny middle column. The script for the interlinear gloss is also quite large, unusually so in this case, making it as striking as the marginal gloss.

104. Philippe Buc calls the run-over gloss a "pistol-shaped" gloss. I am grateful for his suggestion that this kind of gloss alters the interlinear format, so that it becomes part of the marginal commentary.

however, the interlinear gloss serves as an immediate reference to certain biblical words or phrases, highlighting the larger marginal discussions or opening the discussion to further exegesis. A particular allegory is therefore not forced on the reader, nor is meaning fixed. The gloss does, however, present a specific set of avenues into scripture through the multiple association of terms in the terse, interlinear portion.

One of the most influential teachers of the early twelfth century, the English bishop Gilbert the Universal, most likely compiled the gloss on Genesis, which provides its readers with easy access to the Augustinian allegory of the fall of Adam and Eve.[105] Certain relationships immediately become clear through interlocking metonymic shifts: the association of Eve and the animal part that is susceptible to temptation;[106] the association of Adam's rib and the church;[107] the association of Eve with the church;[108] the association of the church with paradise.[109] Points of departure for a discussion of the church are therefore paradise, rib, wife, bestial nature. In the interlinear gloss, Adam is equated with reason, Eve with concupiscence,[110] and more specifically, with the part of the spirit that rejoices in carnality.[111] Eve's labor pains are glossed as the difficulty of defeating depraved tendencies.[112] Her subjection in marriage to Adam is so that the spirit may once again dominate the flesh.[113]

The commentary on Adam and Eve's relationship provides an explanation for coercive authority that expands on Augustine's *City of God*. Essential to the twelfth-century notion of peace was the idea that while hierarchies were natural, domination was an equivalent, postlapsarian consequence. Coercion had become necessary after the fall thanks to a rupture in the natural, hierarchical relationship between husband and wife.[114] In a perfect hierarchical

105. See Beryl Smalley, "Gilbertus Universalis, Bishop of London (1128–34) and the Problem of the 'Glossa Ordinaria,'" *RTAM* 7 (1935): 244–245. Smalley suggests that Gilbert was either Anselm's student or a contemporary at Laon, during Anselm's heyday in the first decade of the twelfth century.

106. Gloss A, 57: "partem animalem quam temptat."

107. Gloss A, 48. The line "tulit unam de costis eius et replevi carnem pro ea" is glossed "ecclesia."

108. Gloss A, 56.

109. Gloss A, 54.

110. Gloss A, 54.

111. Gloss A, 57: "que significat partem illam anime quae gaudet carnalitate."

112. Gloss A, 58: "dolor: difficultate vincende prave consuetudinis."

113. Gloss A, 58: "ut spiritus dominetur carni."

114. As Philippe Buc has asked, is inequality of power natural or a punishment? On the dual modes of authority presented by the exegesis of Genesis, see Buc, *L'ambiguïté du livre*, 72–74, with respect to the Gloss.

relationship, that between the human being and God, persons are willingly drawn through the transformation of desire, and there is no question of domination. The relationship between ruler and ruled, Christ and the church, thus is as seamless as the relationship between a human being and one of his ribs.

Thanks to Adam's reversal of authority between God, himself and Eve, force had become essential to exertion of authority on earth. As Adam's side, Eve had been created to move coordinately with him, not subject to him in the manner of temporal relationships of dominance and submission. That such command had to be forcefully imposed signified a lack of proper concord. The human will was so weak that left to itself the spirit would consent to having its authority usurped by the flesh, if only so as to be left at peace. A struggle for domination, though painful, was necessary because the alternative was Adam's submission to those below him in the hierarchy of command. Twelfth-century authors understood such submission to be the peace of the wicked. In the postlapsarian condition, even divinely mandated authority must announce itself through coercion.

Wicked Peace and Good Will

The collective attitudes of the glossators of Laon are much easier to trace than the contributions of individuals. Anselm dominated the work of his school to the point that it is sometimes hard to extricate his voice from those of his students.[115] However, like other twelfth-century savants who worked on the *Gloss*, Anslem has his name ascribed to commentaries and *sententiae* now buried in seemingly haphazard monastic collections.[116] These works reveal attitudes toward free will, sensory transformation, and peacemaking that if not his own were certainly associated with him. A tract found in a florilegium of Saint-Amand and attributed to Anselm displays ideas about peace that accord with the *Ordinary Gloss* and Augustine's commentaries on Genesis.[117] Following Augustine, Anselm (and I will assume it is he) presented peacemaking

115. See Arthur Michael Landgraf, *Introduction à l'histoire de la littérature théologique de la scholastique naissante*, trans. Louis-B. Geiger (Montreal, 1973), 70 and 72. Beryl Smalley, *Study of the Bible*, 50: "The most we can hope for is a book about the school of Anselm [as opposed to Anselm himself]. The master was one of those scholars who sink their own personality into teamwork."

116. Smalley, *Study of the Bible*, 49: "Modern scholars are occupied in assembling the writings which derive from the school, in trying to distinguish their relationship and to separate Anselm's work from his pupils'. They have shown us how far-reaching his influence was, and have established a direct connection between Laon and the later schools of Paris."

117. BnF Lat 12999. This tract is part of a collection of *sententiae*, partly written, partly compiled by "Master Anselm." Like all attributions in monastic compendia, it must be accepted with caution.

as conflict and negotiation between spirit and flesh. By flesh, he meant not the body itself but, as Augustine had, sensuality or the tendency toward fleshly desire. This tendency was an attribute not only of body but also of soul.[118] Conflict between reason and sensuality was desirable and played out externally through an individual's discernment of worldly matters.

For Anselm the question of peace was tied to the realization of good, which is to say free, will (*bona voluntas*) in society, which one achieved by deriving pleasure from God's works. He therefore laid out a spectrum that posited four kinds of persons: the irredeemably wicked, the wicked who were beginning to become good, those who had more goodness in them than wickedness, and finally, those who were perfectly good. In the extremely good, reason controlled sensuality, and this resulted in correct discernment, the ability to appropriately enjoy the external world. In very rare cases, persons even achieved the peace of which Christ spoke when he said, *beati pacifici* ("Blessed [are the] peaceful," Matt. 5.9). These fortunate ones had peace with God, others, and themselves.[119] On the other hand, the irredeemably wicked also had peace, because reason had completely surrendered; they took pleasure in vanities. At the extremes, then, one internal opponent had so bested the other that all was calm: tranquility prevailed under a state of either extreme blessedness or complete injustice.

Most people, however, dangled somewhere between true and false peace, many in a state of intense but necessary conflict, in which reason battled sensuality:

> [From Gal. 5.17] The flesh covets against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh. In this way, among extremely wicked persons, the spirit is made the servant of its natural subject, sensuality—and good and bad tastes invert themselves. By nature, the taste of the good is happiness (*jocunditas*), while that of the wicked is bitterness. In fact, it seems to evil persons that every good thing tastes bitter but all wickedness tastes pleasant.

In the silence of false peace, Anselm saw the seeds of a greater violence:

> In these people, there is no conflict between spirit and flesh, since when reason is subdued (*depressa*), it does not dare to suggest anything, but all control is subject to sensuality. In this way then [the wicked] have their

118. BnF Lat 12999, fol. 26v: "Carnem vero hic voco non corpus. Sed illam anime proprietatem quae est corpori regendo deputata, et dicitur sensualitas. Spiritus vero hic dicitur ratio, quae est data ad discernendum de quibus dicitur."

119. BnF Lat 12999, fol. 26v: "In his nulla est pugna, quare et pacem habent. De quibus dicitur Beati pacifici, his enim perfecta est *pax* et ad deum, et proximum, et in se, sed hoc genus est rarisimum."

peace, within themselves and among those similar to them, except that very often the flaws quarrel among themselves and attack others.[120]

The peace of the wicked was a terrifying prospect, to which war was preferable. War at least exposed false peace; it might even help end it. As Gregory the Great had counseled, fighting was greatest when peace was in sight; demons thrashed most fiercely on the point of expulsion. When reason openly broke out in rebellion against the tyranny of the flesh, the wise would understand the resultant emotional state as peacemaking, no matter how violent it appeared to be.

The Virtue of Conflict

Teaching in Laon, Anselm the schoolmaster also had to stay attentive to the concerns of his chapter and his city.[121] What appears to be abstract theology is in fact carefully directed by Anselm's concerns with peace and conflict in a region that was beset with multiple cases of social disruption, including heretical movements and communal insurrection. In a self truly at peace, the liberated will expressed itself as good taste. Since reason had been given for the purpose of discerning (*data ad discernendum*), its rule or captivity determined whether wickedness tasted bitter or sweet.[122] Correct discernment then expressed itself through choices made in social and political situations and was essential for pastors to differentiate between seemingly identical bonds, networks, and communities. Anselm opposed the Laon clergy's embrace of a lay imperial courtier, Gaudry, as bishop, and Gaudry's disastrous rule confirmed his judgment.[123] According to Guibert, abbot of nearby

120. BnF Lat 12999, fol. 26v: "Caro concupiscit adversus spiritus spiritum, et spiritus adversus carnem. Igitur in valde malis spiritus ita subiectam sibi naturaliter sensualitatem, servus ipsius factus sit, pervertunt enim boni et mali sapores, boni sapor iocunditas est naturaliter. Mali amaritudo. Ipsis enim malis omne bonum amarum, omne(m) vero malum iocundum videtur. Non est ergo in ipsis inter spiritum et carnem pugna, cum ratio depressa nichil audeat suadere, sed tota potestas subiecta est sensualitati, habent isti igitur suam pacem, inter se et consimiles, nisi quod multotiens vitia inter se discerpunt et alios infestant."

121. B. Smalley, *The Becket Conflict and the Schools: A Study of Intellectuals in Politics* (Totowa, NJ, 1973), 21; and Smalley, *Study of the Bible*, 50, for testimony from Peter the Chanter of Reims. Smalley and Lesley Smith note that the master's attempts to keep peace in his city often distracted him from his work on the biblical gloss. Smith, *Making of a Medieval Bible Commentary*, 20.

122. BnF Lat 12999, fol. 26v. Cf. Isaiah 5.20: "Woe unto you that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter!"

123. Smalley, *Becket Conflict and the Schools*, 20–21.

Nogent-sous-Coucy, Anselm was the only cleric astute enough to recognize Gaudry's unsuitability.[124] As politically aware as this shows the master to have been, Guibert implies that such recognition required a superior ability to read God's word through worldly events.

Educated men who placed themselves at the threshold of altar and marketplace, Anselm and Guibert experienced firsthand the emergence of new forms of communal identity and religious enthusiasm in the growing towns of northern Europe. Discernment became their greatest asset: they were able to tell true peace from false. Tongue in cheek, Guibert admitted that he, a less capable exegete, remained obtuse to the unsuitability of Laon's bishop until, finally, after a series of hints and suggestions, the voice of God boomed forth in the form of a communal uprising.[125] Not long after the commune, the world of the city confronted the monk Guibert with further difficult choices: an outbreak of heresy at Soissons.

A student of Anselm of Canterbury, Guibert seems to have been acutely sensitive to the social and religious transformations now associated with the twelfth century.[126] While his idiosyncratic moral theology appears clumsy (and at times old-fashioned), it represents the effort of an insatiably curious mind not only to comprehend a changing world but also to track the impact of these changes on a participant observer.[127] In *Moralia in Genesim* (consciously indebted to Gregory the Great's *Moralia in Job*) Guibert discussed the mutually responsive but turbulent relationship between interior and exterior worlds.[128] And he identified how the conspiracy of spirit and flesh might be ended.

---

124. Guibert of Nogent, *Monodies* 3.4, in *Autobiographie*, ed. Edmond-René Labande (Paris, 1981), 284: "Solus magister Anselmus, vir totius Franciae, immo latini orbis lumen in liberalibus disciplinis ac tranquillis moribus, ab eius [Galdrici] electione dissensit."

125. The Laon commune is discussed in detail in chapter 7.

126. For Guibert's exegesis with reference to his intellectual context, see Jay Rubenstein, *Guibert of Nogent: Portrait of a Medieval Mind* (New York, 2002).

127. Guibert's theology appeared clumsy, even to his contemporaries. He ran into problems when he attempted to explore sensitive topics such as the nature of the Eucharist, where the slightest slip could lead to charges of blasphemy or worse, heresy. See Rubenstein, *Guibert of Nogent*, 132–134, 136, 138, and 171.

128. See Rubenstein, *Guibert of Nogent*, 31; *Moralia in Genesim*, in BnF Lat 529. Rubenstein argues that this manuscript containing book 1 is the earliest surviving copy. The edited version of this text is *Moralia in Genesin (Moralia Geneseos)*, PL 156:31D-340C. There are many small variations between the manuscript and the edited version. This early commentary in ten books may have been one of Guibert's more widely read works: in the Paris manuscript it accompanies a sermon by a more popular author, Bernard of Clairvaux.

Reconciliation was not an option. Guibert begins his commentary with the words, "In no persons who live well can [spirit and flesh] have peace or balance."[129] In Genesis, therefore, the separation of heaven and earth prefigured conversion, the rending of spirit from flesh. "The earth," says Guibert, "we should accept . . . as either our body or the carnal disposition."

> The disposition of carnality is truly called void. . . . This emptiness chiefly affects the interior man [whose] purpose (*cogitatio*) and attention (*cura*) are turned far from God and only contemplate what is idle or harmful.[130]

God's first act was to separate heaven from earth and to align them in a correct relationship to one another:

> Therefore, God created heaven and earth in those who made the beginnings of conversion with good will and avoided the chaos of vices, since he discerned and sustained in an orderly way the spirit, that is reason, and the earth, that is the carnal condition, that first were carried commingled in the disturbed heart of the faithful.[131]

Similarly, in order to disentangle spirit and flesh, God must create a separate heaven and earth within the convert, so that spirit no longer acts the part of the handmaid, and the flesh no longer dominates it.[132]

Not everyone would accept such a painful regeneration. Guibert's image of the human being is a kingdom usurped. The process required to restore

---

129. BnF Lat 529, fol. 1: "In nullo bene vivente pacem vel momentaneam inter se . . . possunt habere." *Moralia Geneseos*, 32B-C. See below.

130. BnF Lat 529, fol. 1v: "Terram ut dixi vel corpus nostrum vel affectum carnalem debemus istic accipere. Carnalis vero affectus inanis iure dicitur. . . . Quae inanitas precipue ad interiorem pertinet hominem . . . cum longe a deo cogitatio eius et cura versatur et aut ociosum prorsus est aut noxium quod meditatur." *Moralia Geneseos*, 34A-34B. In this context "idle" probably makes the most sense for *otiosum*, but it is worth considering the secondary meaning "unconcerned," since complacency is characteristic of the peace of the wicked.

131. BnF Lat 529, fol. 1: "In his igitur qui chaos vitiorum devitantes principia conversionis bene volente fecerunt. Deus caelum et terram creat quia spiritum, id est rationem et terram, id est carnalem affectum, quae prius confuso in corde fidelium conmixti ferrebantur ordine, discernit et suscitat." *Moralia Geneseos*, 33B.

132. BnF Lat 529, fol. 1v: "Cum itaque ad Deum convertimur rationem quae sub affectu carnali quasi ancilla ordine praepostero et valde perverso iacebat, erigimus, et contra eum qui servili audacia domine suae surrexerat perpetuum certamen exertem proponimus." *Moralia Geneseos*, 57C. (Therefore when we are converted to God, we revive reason, which under the effect of the flesh was like a handmaid under a preposterous order, and which lay down in true perversion; and [we] engage in constant combat against the one who with a servant's audacity has risen up against her mistress.)

the rightful ruler began with severe emotional disturbance—but very few merited the gift of this struggle. Jay Rubenstein remarks that in the *Moralia*, open conflict between spirit and flesh "occurs only in those who try to live as Christians, which probably means 'as monks,'" but "those who live well" may simply refer to those who mortify their flesh through inner torment.[133] Internal discord had become essential to living well because the peace that most people enjoyed was false, a conspiracy. In the beginning, spirit and flesh enjoyed a proper concord, and man was not disturbed by any imbalance. After eating from the forbidden tree, Adam and Eve signaled the loss of this order by recognizing their nakedness. The *perizomata* or girdle with which they encircled themselves signifies concupiscence, the primary insurrection of flesh against the spirit.[134]

Proceeding from this, all of creation became the story of conflict and conspiracy between two necessarily opposing forces. For the earthly lifetime, any semblance of genuine peace was achieved only by keeping the two in a permanent state of enmity. Like Anselm of Laon, Guibert was suggesting that the alternative to struggle was a harzardous quietude: poor judgment and blindness. He showed even more pessimism than his friend, however, denying even the possibility that on earth one could achieve anything more beneficial than constant internal conflict; peace remained but a vision. Better, says Guibert, that God's grace should enter a person's heart as a sting of "reproachful discretion" (*criminosus discretio*) than that the person be intoxicated by his own vices and lose all sense of taste.[135]

Guibert's process of healing and return insisted on grief and terror. "Let there be light" signified the revelation to the self of its own horridness.[136] The canon Hugh, from the abbey school of Saint-Victor in Paris, agreed: "The first thing to say about wisdom is that it is sown through fear."[137] By making persons "poor in spirit," fear led them away from perdition toward the taste of divine love.[138] It entered the mind and extinguished concupiscence, the

133. Rubenstein, *Guibert of Nogent*, 31.

134. BnF Lat 529, fol. 1; *Moralia Geneseos*, 33A.

135. BnF Lat 529, fol. 2; *Moralia Geneseos*, 35B.

136. The six days of creation are stages in spiritual development that Rubenstein suggests correspond to the gifts of the Holy Spirit, mentioned in the book of Isaiah. The seventh day of rest represents completion, a final gift. Rubenstein points out that Guibert has reversed the normal order of presentation, "that is, he ends the list with the greatest gift, wisdom, and begins it with . . . fear." Rubenstein, *Guibert of Nogent*, 32.

137. Hugh, *Archa* 3.2, 55; see above.

138. Hugh, *Archa* 3.2, 56; Matt. 5.3.

tendency to love those things that pleased only the flesh. In these ways, fear and loathing generated peace:

> When lulled [through fear of the Lord] from the din of earthly longings, the mind is directly composed to the quiet of internal peace, and it is prepared out of its same tranquility so that it can be capable of celestial wisdom. Indeed, one does not know [how] to have wisdom except in a peaceful heart, and thus, those in whom earthly desire still clamors, do not know what wisdom is.[139]

Hugh would have been aware of the gloss on Genesis.[140] And though a Neoplatonist in the Augustinian mode, he also brought to bear on the study of human redemption the disciplines of the Aristotelian schola. In his *Didascalicon* and mystical commentaries on Noah's ark, Hugh promoted the liberal arts as a means to cultivate discernment: to read God's visible book of creation in order to discover his intangible book of redemption. As he read Genesis, the account of creation, Hugh would have felt himself transformed through illumination, ascending from the visible to the invisible.[141] The world as a system of signs and meanings provided him with both sacrament and text; its first six days were the first great sacraments.[142] And in this regard, he stressed the importance of an emotional training that would school human sensibilities for recurring journeys between flesh and intellect, between the noise of the marketplace and the quietude of the altar.

In *De sacramentis Christianae fidae* (On the Sacraments of the Christian Faith), Hugh identified three sources of movement in the human being, the

---

139. Hugh, *Archa* 3.2, 56: "Sopito deinde terrenorum desideriorum strepitu, continuo mens ad quietem interne *pacis* componitur, et ut c*apax* esse possit celestis sapientie, ex ipsa sua tranquillitate preparatur. Sapientia enim habitare nescit nisi in corde pacifico, et ideo illi, in quibus adhuc terrena desideria perstrepunt, que sit sapientia non noverunt."

140. The Gloss made its presence felt at the abbey of Saint-Victor. A set of mid-twelfth-century allegories mistakenly attributed to Hugh makes the following associations: "Adam significat spiritum. Eva carnem. Sicut enim Adam regit Evam, sic spiritus debet regere carnem suam." Hugh incertus, *Allegoriae in vetus testamentum* 1.7, PL 175:639C. The author then explains the allegories with a minimum of detail. These may have been notes made as preparation for teaching, or for a larger treatise. Most exegetes of the period, while working from a number of texts, may have relied on outlines of this kind in writing their commentaries. Certainly many scholars made a practice of "glossing the Gloss" on Genesis. Theologians such as Peter Lombard gave great currency to the Laon gloss when they used it as the basis of their own scriptural lectures and commentaries. Smalley, *Study of the Bible,* 64–66.

141. Spijker, *Fictions of the Inner Life*, 16, claims that Hugh's disciple Richard perfected this notion of transformation of the self through exegesis.

142. Hugh of Saint-Victor, *De sacramentis Christianae fidae*, 1.1.12, PL 176:195C–197B.

motive forces of mind, body, and sensuality. In any decision, the will (*voluntas*) expressed the mind's motive force, while sensuality expressed its motive force as pleasure.[143] The body moved obedient to the decision, which was just, so long as the mind moved in accordance with God. This sequence of commands produced culpability:

> The vice belongs to the one who commands, and the duty [to obey] to the one who obeys. Nor is he who is led culpable, since he is led by necessity; but instead the one who leads is culpable, since he abuses his liberty in [the person of] the follower (*subjectum*).[144]

When disobedient of God, a mind was still able to elicit obedience from the body, but as punishment it received from sensuality a contradictory motive force. Depending on its own strength, the mind might be able to control and thus moderate the violence of sensuality, but if subdued, the human being would sin; the kingdom of the self would be held in unjust captivity.[145] It was a conspiracy that always began at the level of leadership before its effects extended downward, as blindness, complacency, and perversion of judgment: false peace. Like a subject people, the body would naturally obey the victor.[146] Lacking any authority to declare war on sensuality, the body could communicate to the mind only through pain.[147] Only a healthy terror would liberate the mind from violence of the flesh.[148] These constructions of the contesting and communicating inner self extended into a blueprint for political obedience and command. Hugh's image of spirit governing flesh led him to insist that the spiritual authority must establish the temporal one,

---

143. Hugh, *De sacramentis* 1.6.4, 265C: "In the primary disposition of nature the voluntary motive force of the mind is a desire: in that it is voluntary, it is free; in its desire it is a decision."

144. Hugh, *De sacramentis* 1.6.4, 265D-266A: "Vitium est imperantis, debitum obedientis. Nec culpatur qui ducitur quia necessitate dicitur; sed culpatur qui ducit, quia in subjectum abutitur libertate."

145. Hugh, *De sacramentis* 1.6.4, 266A.

146. One could take a further step into the analogy and argue that as the body represents the base, or *laboratores*, the contesting factions of reason and sensuality might refer to priests and knights. This relationship is not made explicit, nor are the two ruling players identified. However, the inverted triangular relationship of power (two over one) is suggestive of the Three Orders model. Cf. Buc, *L'ambiguïté du livre*, 75–87, for an equivalent development of the Three Orders relationship in the twelfth-century *Glossa ordinaria*.

147. Cf. Morrison, *Mimetic Tradition*, 136–161.

148 Hugh, *Archa* 3.3, 57: "mens hominis quadam—ut ita dixerim—*violentia* a delectatione carnali per timorem abstracta."

and judge it if it had erred—words that dominate an iconic claim of papal sovereignty, Benedict VIII's bull *Unam Sanctam*.

Thus it was not just secular scholars who imagined a turbulent peacemaking. If anything, cloistral attitudes to peace and reconciliation have more sting. Hugh, a regular canon, would have considered himself more of a monk. And the Cistercian "mystics" who wrote about peace and love presented no less aggressive an understanding of these terms. The Cistercian Charter of Charity invokes a mutual peace that will unite its members in spirit even though they are divided in body, but that peace could take the form of policing and rebuke, and devotional writings of the order focus on peace as forceful liberation from complacency. A detailed, if derivative, description of the internal conspiracy comes from an anonymous text, cited first by Alan of Lille at the end of the twelfth century, and possibly written by a companion of the Cistercian recluse Isaac of Stella.[149] The anonymous compiler describes the conspiracy of spirit and flesh as Babylonian captivity.[150] The blessed city of Jerusalem has made an uneasy peace; in short, spirit has allowed flesh to rule within the human soul. Even though the soul feels oppression under the rule of the flesh, it continues to love its prison and delights in the worldly things that delight the body: "It is joined to our body by certain desires and a certain friendship which keep us from hating our flesh."[151] Thus it leaves itself open to vices, relaxing its defenses and preparing an occasion for sin. In this way, what was once an admirable union of body and soul is now rendered wretched because the sequence of obedience and command has been perverted.[152]

While peace served as a governing principle of their order, the Cistercians also considered internal transformation a prerequisite for reform outside the cloister. Bernard of Clairvaux counseled initiates that only those who were peaceful themselves could be true peacemakers in society.[153] The Cisterican Aelred of Rievaulx helped mediate the concord between the empress Mathilda and King Stephen during their contest for the English throne. As Paul Dalton has noted, a monk like Aelred's theology of peacemaking bears

149. See *Treatise on the Spirit and Soul*, trans. Erasmo Leiva and Sister Benedicta, in *Three Treatises on Man: A Cistercian Anthropology*, ed. Bernard McGinn (Kalamazoo, MI, 1977), 181–288.

150. *Treatise on the Soul*, 201.

151. *Treatise on the Soul*, 201.

152. *Treatise on the Soul*, 203.

153. Bernard of Clairvaux, *Ad clericos de conversione*, in *Sämtliche Werke* 4, ed. G. Winkler and H. Brem (Innsbruck, 1992), 110.

a close resemblance to his methods of mediation.[154] In his *De speculo caritatis* (Mirror of Charity), devoted to reformation in God's image, Aelred discusses peace as the Sabbaths in Leviticus: the seventh day, the seventh year, and the year after the forty-ninth year.[155] Inner peacemaking, the first Sabbath, is the sine qua non for the realization of the others.[156] Human beings experience the first Sabbath when they make peace within themselves, the second when they make peace with their neighbors, and the third when they have peace with God.[157] The entire process moves from the separation of the individual from natural bonds, such as parentage and kinship, his or her entry into social bonds, to the ultimate bond with God that arises from the other two.[158] The process, Augustinian and abstract on the one hand, also parallels the sequence of amities that Gerd Althoff has placed at the core of high medieval politics: kinship, friendship, and finally lordship.[159] But like Guibert, Hugh, and his Cisterican contemporaries, Aelred describes peacemaking as incessant conflict.

Aelred follows Augustine's idea that all things have tranquility within their own order; their parts are joined in a bond of unity through some kind of peace, good or wicked. To transfer a part from one peaceful bond to another, then, one needs a disturbance, until the part can find rest again in

154. For Aelred as peacemaker during Stephen's anarchy, see Paul Dalton, "Churchmen and the Promotion of Peace in King Stephen's Reign," *Viator* 31 (2000): 79–119, esp. 87, 90–91, 97–99.

155. Aelred, *De speculo caritatis* 3.1.1, ed. A. Hoste and C. H. Talbot, CCCM 1:105 (henceforth *De spec. car.*): "Habes nempe in lege tria tempora sabbati requiei consecrata: septimum videlicet diem, septimum annum, et post septies septem quinquagesimum annum."

156. *De spec. car.* 3.2.4, 107: "Praecedit ergo quodammodo dilectionem Dei dilectio proximi; dilectionem vero proximi dilectio sui: praecedit, inquam, ordine, non dignitate. . . . Ut ergo homo se diligat, in ipso Dei dilectio inchoatur; ut diligat proximum, dilectionem ad illud sublime et ineffabile bonum abducens, ubi nec ipse a se, nec proximus diligatur, nisi in quantum uterque deficiens a se, totus transfertur in Deum."

157. *De spec. car.* 3.2.3, 106: "Sit ergo homini dilectio sui sabbatum primum: dilectio proximi sit secundum, Dei autem dilectio Sabbatum Sabbatorum. Est autem, ut superius diximus, sabbatum spiritale requies animi, *pax* cordis, tranquillitas mentis. Et hoc Sabbatum nonnunquam in propria dilectione sentitur, aliquando ex dulcedine fraternae dilectionis hauritur, in Dei autem dilectione absque ulla ambiquitate perficitur."

158. See *De spec. car.* 3.4.7–12, 108–111. This process also describes the transition from Law to Grace. The period of natural bonds is the period before Moses brought law to society, the period between the first and second Sabbath the time under the law, the period from the second to third Sabbath the time of the Spirit, until in the perfection of the Law there is no law. Cf. Bernard, *De conversione* 18.31, 224–226.

159. See Gerd Althoff, *Family, Friends, and Followers: Political and Social Bonds in Early Medieval Europe*, trans. Christopher Carroll (Cambridge, 2004).

the new pattern. Reason produces constant disturbance because the rational soul desires tranquility consistent with happiness (true peace), while the flesh produces a contrary affect, a false image designed to mislead reason.[160] Thus, placated desires always prevent the human being from demanding true peace. In this way, humanity is miserable and restless but paralyzed by a mimic peace.

The mark of false peace was tranquility that erupted into a tempest on slight provocation: a system simmering on the verge of destruction. According to Aelred, the laxness of a habitually self-centered mind disguised itself "as God's tranquil yoke," at least as long as no agitation arose. However, when a person under false peace felt anger, a beast awoke, allowing no peace for the soul.[161] What pertained to the self also extended to society. Thus, for Guibert of Nogent, a communal uprising at Laon exemplified hidden violence that had inevitably forced itself into the open.

In twelfth-century visions of spiritual captivity, grief, terror, anger, and conflict had important, purgative roles to play. They exposed false peace as hidden violence and fomented an insurrection to restore right order. Of course for such disturbances to have a beneficial effect, the reprimand must be properly read and understood; otherwise, they would be mere punishment not education. Like any sacrament, a reconciling compunction was "accorded to the elect for advancement, and to the reprobate for judgment."[162] For this reason, above all, those who wished to live well must discipline their senses and cultivate discretion.

Bernard of Clairvaux often described discretion as love's discipline. In his forty-ninth sermon on the Song of Songs, he makes the words "He ordered love in me" (Song of Sol. 2.4) a point of departure for describing discretion as a moderating and regulating force of the virtues: "Remove it from there and virtues will be vices, and natural affection will be transformed into nature's great confounder and destroyer."[163] Discretion applied not only to Bernard's fellow Cistercians but also to other groups in the

160. Aelred, *De spec. car.* 1.21.60–61, 38.

161. Aelred, *De spec. car.* 2.3.6, 68.

162. Aelred, *De spec. car.* 2.9.22–23.

163. Bernard, *Sermones in Cantica Canticorum* 49, PL 183:1018B: "Tolle hanc, et virtus vitium erit, ipsaque affectio naturalis in perturbationem magis convertetur, exterminiumque naturae." See also a summary of these ideas in Bernard, *De discrimine inter plebem et praesulem*, PL 183:727A-B.

church, including seculars and laypersons who wished to live as a community. "It is essential so that love may bind us all and compound us into the unity of Christ's body, which [love] cannot achieve at all if it has not been also ordered."[164] In the Christian tradition, love maintained community, while peace sustained and protected it. But peace and love often presented contrary demands, at once universalizing and exclusive. While it was imperative for members to harmonize, on earth true peace also meant restlessness and separation from toxic friendships. As a result, those who sought peace often found its shadow: harmony became concupiscence; restlessness produced isolation.

Such theologies of the interior demonstrate why acknowledgment of the outside world had become so important even to monks. They explain why conflict had become a distinctive marker of love's directedness. While driven by a hermeneutic imperative that located meaning within, medieval churchmen also developed a fascination with surfaces, and with the conundrums that God had presented humanity when the flesh interposed between reason and the outside world. As the body became merely reflexive of the self's motivation, its appropriate communication with the soul became a model of concord between church and society. Under a proper peace, a rightly guided sequence of communication between internal pleasures and external demands would transform both body and world.

The body was not the soul's prison but its messenger. "For when a good action reaches perfection," Peter Damian said, "then in the mind of the actor, the light of spiritual grace appears, so that when he pursues a shining work in public, inwardly his spirit is illuminated with the same grace."[165] According to Hugh of Saint-Victor, human beings were luckier than angels or beasts because they possessed both reason and sensuality: capacities for internal as well as external delight.[166] Negotiation between interior and exterior taught

164. Bernard, *Serm. Cant. Cant.* 49, 1018C: "Oportet autem ut hos una omnes charitas liget, et contemperet in unitatem corporis Christi: quod minime omnino facere poterit, si ipsa non fuerit ordinata."

165. Damian, *Mystica*, 843C-D: "Nam cum opus bonum ad perfectionem pervenit, tunc in operantis mente lux gratiae spiritualis exoritur, ut dum lucidum opus foris exsequitur, intrinsecus ipsa gratia spiritus illustretur." Damian held that the act of reading world and text shaped the reader as well. Spijker, *Fictions of the Inner Life*, 32: "The *homo interior* is not an aspect of man which is always there but its creation occurs in the process of reading."

166. Hugh, *De sacramentis* 1.6.5, 266B-267B. Hugh says that in human beings the sequence of perception is from outside to within. In angels, perception is from inside to outside.

man about the distance he had fallen, and led him back to reconciliation with his Creator.[167]

The process of bridging the gap must be violent and unceasing, begun in fear and self-loathing, and finding rest only in an internal civil war. Human reason was in captivity, having made a deleterious truce with the flesh. Reliant on the external senses for its understanding of the material world, the spirit had been pacified beyond resistance. True peace required the spirit to rise against its captor and restore the rule of reason over carnality. The literal meaning of the word Jerusalem—"vision of peace"—structured this notion of peacemaking. "Vision of peace" implied that on earth the perfect peace of the heavenly city remained unattainable, but it could be evoked when the self responded appropriately to external stimuli. By the end of the eleventh century, the discipline of scriptural exegesis had become a part of this project for sensory transformation. Once they had penetrated the letter to achieve the spirit, exegetes discovered a blueprint for peace in self as well as society: confutation of the concord between spirit and flesh, so that the former emerged from its somnolence and turned against its captor.

For those who lived under a Rule, monastic techniques that included isolation, humiliation, and mortification of the flesh had helped to break the will and teach the senses to reject superficial pleasures in favor of deeper loves. For secular scholars and fellow intellectuals in the twelfth century, exegesis became a similar occasion for the transformation of desires, the opportunity to rise from the seemingly concrete letter to the ephemeral spirit, through a process that included puzzlement, fear, and even distaste. A clarion call to exegetes would be Christ's words to those followers who shrank from the idea of consuming his flesh: "Does this shock you?"[168] Like acceptance of Christ's body in the sacrament, exegesis required one to ruminate on the puzzling and even horrific signs by means of which divinity displayed forgiveness to fallen humanity.

---

167. As Carolyn Walker Bynum and Nancy Caciola have shown, in western Europe from the twelfth century onward, both clerical and lay religious expressed moral concerns in terms of the relationship between internal and external landscapes: the transparency or opacity of physical gestures, the ability to recognize dissimulation and bad intention in the external countenance. Caroline Walker Bynum, "Did the Twelfth Century Discover the Individual?" *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages* (Berkeley, 1982), 89–95; Bynum, *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women* (Berkeley, 1987), esp. 252–255; and Nancy Caciola, *Discerning Spirits: Divine and Demonic Possession in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY, 2003).

168. John 16.62. And see John 16.61: "Many therefore of his disciples, hearing it, said: 'This saying is hard, and who can hear it?'"

The exegetical process thus became the basis of a sensory change that most people experienced only in the sacrament. Church fathers like Augustine and Gregory the Great had set the pattern for this interest, transposing ascetic and exegetical disciplines onto a larger stage of individual and universal salvation. Making peace was first and foremost an imaginative act. God's redemptive work lurked beneath the most mundane, seemingly nonsensical or chaotic episodes. It took effort to transcend the surface of events and grasp their meaning. The imagination acted as emissary between material and spiritual impulses, a hub of communication.[169] The rational elements of the material being were drawn up through the imagination into the spiritual realm. Outward action, whatever it might be, must follow from peace achieved at this gateway between spirit and flesh.

A conception of peace as conflict and negotiation between internal and external landscapes allowed twelfth-century clerics to find a place for the *saeculum*—the eternity of earthly existence—in their blueprints of reform and salvation. As Augustine had advised in his *Tractates on the Gospel of John*, the flesh could not be ignored: for would not human beings be resurrected in spirit as well as glorified flesh at the end of time? The flesh provided the entrée to redemptive works: the taking up of the sacrament, the encounter with word and Word. It marked the interface of self and world where educated tastes could help a person experience and accept the promise of future reconciliation with the Creator. The conflict between spirit and flesh was a gift of peace vouchsafed to humanity alone. Since they had no flesh to pacify, there could be no such redemption for fallen angels.[170]

---

169. See Isaac of Stella, "The Letter on the Soul," in McGinn, *Three Treatises on Man*, 155–177.

170. Dyan Elliott remarks that no theologian worth the name would resort to the syllogism "One needs a body to reconcile with God—demons lack a body—demons cannot reconcile with God." However, she does allow for a fairly pervasive understanding in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries that the incarnate body enabled human beings an access to reconciliation that was denied to demons. Without carnality, the fleshly aspect of the body, the fallen angels only remain conscious of their fall with no access to return. See Elliott, *Fallen Bodies: Pollution, Sexuality, and Demonology in the Middle Ages* (Philadelphia, 1999), 137 and 134.

CHAPTER 6

Exporting Peace

Ecclesiology and Evangelism

In 1143, Evervin, the abbot of Steinfeld, wrote a troubled letter to Bernard of Clairvaux, relating the final testament of a group of men accused of heresy and then slaughtered by a mob in Cologne:

> We maintain this much, that we do not pertain to this world: You lovers of the world have peace with the world, since you are of the world. Pseudoapostles, corrupting the word of Christ, and seeking their own benefit, led you and your fathers astray; [but] we, and our fathers, having been born as apostles, remain in the grace of Christ, and shall continue in it unto the end of this age.[1]

Even the abbot was taken aback at their conviction, perhaps both relieved and disturbed that the decision on their fate had not been his. These men

1. Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistolae* no. 1572, PL 182:678A: "Nos hoc sustinemus, quia de mundo non sumus: vos autem mundi amatores, cura mundo pacem habetis, quia de mundo estis. Pseudoapostoli adulterantes verbum Christi, quae sua sunt quaesiverunt, vos et patres vestros exorbitare fecerunt: nos et patres nostri generati apostoli, in gratia Christi permansimus, et in finem saeculi permanebimus." See Herbert Grundmann, *Religious Movements in the Middle Ages: The Historical Links between Heresy, the Mendicant Orders, and the Women's Religious Movement in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Century, with the Historical Foundations of German Mysticism*, trans. Steven Rowan (Notre Dame, IN, 1995), 10.

presented themselves as reformers, successors to the lifestyle of Christ's apostles.[2] But this claim of a separate peace, and one divorced from world, placed the men in a perilous position, especially at a time when monks and canons were embracing the Augustinian argument that all of creation, body and soul, letter and spirit, must participate in the economy of salvation.

The *vita activa* of early twelfth-century churchmen raised several concerns for its practitioners and critics: the definition and place of secular activities; the tension between a universal community and an unblemished one; the sense of living through significant events of salvation history rather than after them, and the corresponding need to fashion the present according to the demands of scriptural past and future. While bishops had always been political beings, the reform of twelfth-century monks and canons asked religious simultaneously to separate themselves from earthly demands and to model themselves on mortal weaknesses. Cistercians like Bernard emphasized a combination of self-reliance, introspection, internal discipline, and charity. Canonial movements sought a more active component to the regular life and thus worked to dismantle incompatibilities between the cloister and ministry. New groups emerged around a variety of approaches to "living well," defined broadly as living in imitation of the apostles. In French and Italian cities, laymen began to preach and to take vows of wandering poverty. As Latin Christians made their way northeast in the aftermath of the First Crusade, accounts emerged of evangelical work among the pagans of the Baltic, both missionary and military. These expansionist attitudes left churchmen open to criticisms of *curiositas*, too great an interest in the affairs of the world.

But was the *vita activa* a symptom or an antidote of "peace with the world"? The Cologne apostles had reflected anxieties that dogged late eleventh- and twelfth-century evangelists: fears of contamination as they explored and exploited a newly constituted secular landscape. Canons, bishops, and monks responded with blueprints for the coordination of their active church, while defending its purity. Biblical commentators interpreted the first evangelical missions, conducted by Christ's disciples in Galilee, in order to discover how servants of the living church both exemplified true peace and conveyed it to others. It had become necessary for the clergy to demonstrate that while secular engagement would not disrupt the peace of the church, conveyance of the true peace to the world *must* be a disruptive process that exploited secular instruments such as carnal seduction, emotional assault, and physical force.

---

2. Bernard, *Epistolae* no. 1572, 676A-680A.

Peace in Models of Ecclesial Community

Ironically it was an outcast Donatist, Tyconius, who voiced the imperative for a church that embraced all manner of persons, regardless of taints that might accrue. In response to violent clashes between Donatists and Catholics in the late fourth century, the Theodosian court at Ravenna had issued repressive legislation. In light of these persecutions, Tyconius considered that the Roman Empire had invaded and then embraced the church, thus extending its own lifetime, grafting itself on the *saeculum*. On the verge of apocalypse, the devil had played his final card. The sign of this abominable pact was the readiness with which fellow Christians now wielded the machinery of the Roman state against dissenters.[3]

Seduced into a secular marriage after Constantine, the earthly church must therefore contain both the good and the wicked. Tyconius spoke of the church as a body both "black and beautiful." In his book of rules, he expounds on Song of Songs 1.4: "I am black and beautiful, daughters of Jerusalem, just like the tents of Kedar, like the curtains of Solomon."[4] The mystery is that such a body can be "wholly beautiful" and without fault and at the same time contain a part that is black.[5] The words "black and beautiful" in the song also liken the spouse to two tents: the tent of Kedar and also Solomon's tent, the latter royal and the former subservient. Kedar is the son of Ishmael, with whom Israel (the church) has long sojourned and had peace—but that peace has made it black. The spouse's song affirms that the church must tolerate both the royal and the servile within its encampment.[6]

In this way scripture had indicated that the church must remain bifurcated in order for one part to receive eventual punishment.[7] In earthly time, God

3. R. A. Markus, *Saeculum: History and Society in the Theology of St. Augustine*, rev. ed. (Cambridge, 1988), 115–116.

4. Tyconius, *Liber regularum* 2, ed. William S. Babcock (Atlanta, 1989), 18. Tyconius urges: "It is not possible that the church . . . which the Lord purified with his own blood—can be black, on any part, except in the left portion through which 'God's name is blasphemed by gentiles.'" This reference must be to the pagans, whose presence does not constitute a paradox. Tyconius's Latin Bible apparently read "fusca sum *et* decora," as opposed to the now-accepted Vulgate version "nigra sum *sed* formo(n)sa."

5. Cf. Song of Sol. 4.7

6. Tyconius, *Liber regularum* 2, 18–20.

7. For example, the seven angels in Revelations are keepers of God's laws yet also those who must repent for crimes. The servant that the master finds at work in the Gospel of Matthew is also both blessed and wicked: the Lord will "split him into two" and put the wicked part with the hypocrites. Tyconius argues that this same hermeneutic must pertain to any scriptural passage "in which God says that Israel deserves to perish as it will or that its legacy is execrable." Tyconius, *Liber regularum* 2, 20.

united with the church to grow a temple whose "other part, although it is being constructed with great blocks of stone, will be destroyed and 'not one stone will be left upon another'" (Matt. 24.2). Robert Markus argues that this division is the key to the *eschaton* for Tyconius, and also for Augustine, who acknowledged the Donatist's influence.[8] Tyconius saw a church that must tolerate the pious and wicked within its boundaries in anticipation of the end. This bifurcation till eternity became the basis for Augustine's conception of a Christian political order. It would also form the basis of blueprints for a universal church during the ecclesiastical reform movements of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, at a time when peace once again came under threat and suspicion.

In an imperfect world, then, God's gifts were mediated by imperfect methods of domination, seduction, obedience, and resistance. Twelfth-century churchmen who recognized this mediation also educated themselves regarding the dangers. William of Saint-Thierry, a Cistercian, warned that too great an interest in secular community would produce concupiscence; instead, negotiations between spirit and flesh in the microcosm of man should suffice as lessons for redemption.[9] Others, especially canons, were willing to move beyond the microcosm; they provided the theological justification for enhanced pastoral and evangelical projects. Hugh of Saint-Victor and Gerhoh of Reichersberg argued that despite the risks of concupiscence to the observer, secular lessons must be learned through participation. *Pax*, a gift from the clergy to others, also gave them a uniform that would protect them during their evangelical activities. Dwelling on material things would not produce taints if a sojourner in the world retained his love for the peace of the church. Gerhoh imagined the church clothed by a tunic that was invulnerable to political and material stresses. Secular princes could not rend it, as King Saul had torn the tunic of Samuel.[10] Political conflicts in particular would never be able to ruin this internally shared

8. Markus, *Saeculum*, 116–117.

9. William of Saint-Thierry, *De natura corporis et animae libri duo*, PL 180:695B and 696B: "Qui enim non immoratur in eis quae sunt, per sapientiae contemplationem, ingreditur necessario in aliena per curiositatis vanitatem." David Bell, *The Image and Likeness: The Augustinian Spirituality of William of St Thierry* (Kalamazoo, MI, 1984), 95, cites William's warning to his fellow monks regarding the dangers of imagining worldly objects of desire (most likely the exercises prescribed by canons such as Hugh of Saint-Victor).

10. Gerhoh of Reichersberg, *Opusculum de edificio Dei*, ed. E. Sackur, MGH LDL 3:139: "quae est enim tunica, qua dominicum corpus vestitur, nisi virtus Spiritus sancti, qua aecclesia invisibiliter ornatur?"

garment.[11] In fact, by virtue of existence in God, even evil things were turned to the work of salvation.[12]

Thus, Tyconian images abounded. Gerhoh described the church as a temple of the peacemaker king, Solomon: it was a structure of universal redemption, where authority was in the hands of priests, but all of society had a part.[13] This edifice of God included not just spiritually worthy elements but also the wicked and unworthy. No part of God's creation was superfluous; rather it was a body whose beauty came from its integrity, where individual parts could not be fully understood separately from one another.[14] All creation, good and evil, participated in building the edifice of God.[15] The structure developed through time, perfecting itself as it expanded to engage all society. Of course, in the perfection of the edifice there could be no place for the reprobate, so the wicked were just the *adjuvantes*, the supports on which the structure rose, but not its composite material.[16] That some elements were ultimately discarded, used but not assimilated, made them no less a part of the formative process.

The unblemished tunic and the edifice of God were two images of a body that was infinitely greater than the sum of its members. Like the sacrament of Christ's body, Gerhoh's universal, expanding church allowed all to participate while nourishing only the worthy. The peace of the sacrament made the congregation more than a collective: it made it a convocation, and this distinction governed the church's expansion in the world.[17] As with Judas's communion, sinners in the church partook of God's perfect body and contributed to its organic building process but gained nothing: they did not

11. Gerhoh, *De edificio Dei*, 139–140: "What is this tunic that clothes the body of the Lord if not the power (*virtus*) of the Holy Spirit, by which the church is invisibly adorned?"

12. Hugh of Saint-Victor similarly describes how God turns evil things to his own ends. Book 3 of Guibert of Nogent's *Monodies* is almost entirely given over to this theme. P. Buc, *L'ambiguïté du livre: Prince, pouvoir, et peuple dans les commentaires de la Bible au Moyen Âge* (Paris, 1994), 211–212, discusses how the wicked are seen to be eaten differently from the good (dead instead of alive) in the Dominican gloss on *Genesis*.

13. *De edificio Dei*, 140: "Nec desinent isti mures regnum et principes eius persequi, donec arca ad populum suum cum honore ac muneribus dimittatur, ubi a Salemone rege pacifico templum illi construatur; in quo non regibus sed solis sacerdotibus potestas ministrandi tribuatur."

14. Gerhoh of Reichersberg, *Liber de aedificio Dei*, PL 194:1194. (The MGH LDL edition contains only excerpts of this treatise. It does not contain this portion of the work.)

15. *De aedificio Dei*, 1193B–1194A.

16. *De aedificio Dei*, 1196A–C.

17. Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiarum sive originum* 8.1–8, ed. W. M. Lindsay, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1911).

share its peace.[18] The church absorbed the *saeculum*, but its peace was not diminished by it.

Even as it described membership and adherence in the church, peace provided a model for communication. Communion, the making and maintenance of sacramental peace, shaped visions of Christian community. If the church was Christ's body, a body in perfect peace, then the community must construct itself in imitation of peace, rigorously defined. As images of Christ's body evolved during the twelfth century, churchmen began to use *corpus mysticum* (a term for the invisible Christ in the sacrament) for the spiritual collectivity of Christians.[19] During the debate over Judas's communion, the canon Alger of Liège had identified the *corpus*'s vivifying principle: peace allowed persons to live in the body as thriving limbs coordinate with the head. Since the process of perfection mimed the harmony and integrity of Christ's body, new notions of peace emphasized how this body must function internally. Individuals participated in the community of the church through imitation of an identity between spirit and flesh found only in Christ.[20] In dynamic terms, this meant a process of signification, command, and feedback between the greater members inside the body and the lesser ones closer to the outside world. Peace between inside and outside, spirit and flesh, altar and marketplace, inspired twelfth-century blueprints of a constantly reforming church.

A manual for monks and canons, most likely written by a secular canon in the diocese of Liège sometime between 1121 and 1161, emphasizes the collegiality of bodily elements, the fluidity of the redemptive process, and the harmonious communication of different but equally valuable members in the body of the church.[21] Liège was an important university center that hosted

---

18. Like the Catholicism of Augustine, the twelfth-century church "was hungry for souls: let it eat, indiscriminately if needs be." P. Brown, *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography* (Berkeley, 1969), 214.

19. Henri de Lubac, *Corpus mysticum: L'Eucharistie et l'Église au Moyen Âge; Étude historique* (Paris, 1949).

20. Karl F. Morrison, *The Mimetic Tradition of Reform in the West* (Princeton, NJ, 1982), 69: "As Augustine lectured to his congregation on the problem of form and likeness in the theology of the Word, he attributed high importance to one premise: thought and Word were equal and identical in the Godhead, just as were seeing and being." Such unity was of course impossible in the human condition, but that did not mean it should not be mimed and approximated.

21. See *Libellus de diversis ordinibus et professionibus qui sunt in aecclesia*, ed. and trans. G. Constable and B. Smith (Oxford, 1972), xiv–xv (henceforth *LDO*). In the fourteenth or fifteenth century, the manuscript belonged to the abbey of Saint James of Liège. The prologue indicates that the author was a canon. *LDO*, 2: "Ne enim dicatur de me quod in hoc opere quaeram quod meum est, meque honorae velim, ideo canonicos primo loco non ponam."

several polemical debates at the beginning of the twelfth century, including disputes regarding the relative merits of active and contemplative living.[22] In this controversialist climate, the *Libellus de diversis ordinibus et professionibus qui sunt in ecclesia* (The Little Book of Diverse Orders and Professions that are in the Church) harmonized the basic principles of ecclesiastical practice, using Christ's body as the framework for the church's peace, unity, and internal coordination.[23] The author, who calls himself "R.," presents the treatise as a mediation, undertaken to show that the differences among various callings of the church is not a problem and is sanctioned by God.[24] Monks and canons are various aspects of Christ, whose primacy is not determined by profession. All clerics imitate attributes of Christ to a greater or lesser extent. His body is the exemplar of peace and unity on which the church patterns the integration of orders. The *Libellus* retains the Pauline notion that members of Christ's body enjoy variant dignities, but also stresses that participation in this body renders every member equally essential.[25] In order to assign dignities while still maintaining the peace of the church, the author presents separate, parallel hierarchies of monks and canons.[26] Some monks and canons just serve the altar, others just work in the town, and some move between altar and town, relaying commands and bringing in new members.[27]

Stationed between the altar and the courtyard of the tabernacle, the canons and monks who move back and forth are subdivided further into those who look after things by the altar, those who carry the vessels of ministry to the courtyard of the tabernacle, and finally those who stand at the entrance to the courtyard.[28] R. equates canons who serve cathedral chapters in cities with

22. Rupert of Deutz was at the center of many of the controversies that concerned sacramental change and its relationship to membership in the church. He also held strong opinions on the virtues of the monastic versus the canonial vocation, leading to responses over several generations from seculars like Anselm of Havelberg.

23. The author's need to allay concerns regarding the variety of orders in the church suggests that to some clerics diversity itself may have been a threat to peace.

24. At regular intervals, the author reiterates his desire to preserve the peace of the universal church through the eradication of doubts, the mediation of conflicting viewpoints, or the prevention of jealousies as to the arrangement of orders. See *LDO*, 2, 32–34, 42–44.

25. Cf. Rom. 12.4–6. Following Paul, Alger of Liège had also argued that members of Christ's body enjoy a variety of dignities.

26. *LDO*, 2–4. This in stark contrast to arguments between the monk Rupert and the canon Anselm over which profession had the higher calling. See below.

27. *LDO*, 62, with regard to those clerics who serve in the town; 66–68, with regard to those who serve the altar; 78–82 and 86, with regard to those who look toward both the world and the altar.

28. *LDO*, 78.

the sons of Gershon, one of the tribe of Levi. They are Gershonites, because the word Gershon means "stranger."[29] Imitating Christ, who walked as a stranger in the world, the Gershonites move among men to serve as models of persons who, wherever they might be in body, feel absent from God. Their *conversatio* is not on earth but in heaven.[30] For the sake of others, these clergy continue to engage the challenges of the flesh, even as they look inward toward the altar for their own sustenance.[31] Given that this is a defense of the *vita activa* of secular canons, R. was most likely a "Gershonite" himself.

According to the author, monks who lived close to cities had a parallel profession, and like the Gershonites, they sacrificed personal dignity to that end. Their proximity to laypersons enabled monks to serve as a means of conversion, through both their preaching and their example.[32] They would leave their altar to bring Christ's body to laypersons, traversing a "fire of tribulation" in the secular realm.[33] Yet in order to change others, they themselves must change, taking on weakness, so as to provide "a fellowship of the weak" for those new in faith. It was an act of compassion as counseled by Gregory the Great, "so that made weak by the weak they may win the weak."[34]

Coordination, command, and absorption in Christ's body thus took place through a mutual mimetic process. While they taught by example in the town, the mediating members of Christ's body must take on both the likeness of God and the likeness of weak humanity in order to gather persons into the church.[35] The town, with its marketplace, became a locus for negotiation—between spiritual and carnal elements in the church (i.e., clergy

29. *LDO*, 74.

30. *LDO*, 74.

31. *LDO*, 78: "iuxta homines manentes ad interiora quae significantur et per ea quae ad altare pertinent et per vasa ministerii propter se ipsos resideant, et rursus propter alios ad exteriora respiciant." See *LDO* 27 for a similar statement regarding monks who live near cities. Scholars like Gerhoh of Reichersberg and Alger of Liège can be counted among such cathedralite or "Gershonite" canons. Around 1140, in his *Epistola apologetica*, Anselm of Havelberg, a disciple of Norbert of Xanten, made a similar argument (but mainly as an *apologia* for canons regular) that the canon could best balance the demands of inside and outside: preaching, service to the altar, and exemplarity. See Jay T. Lees, *Anselm of Havelberg: Deeds into Words in the Twelfth Century* (Leiden, 1998), 141–151.

32. *LDO*, 20. R. calls these monks prophets among the Philistines, who bring the "odor of life unto life" for the worthy, and the "odor of death unto death" for the unworthy (cf. 1 Sam. 10.5–6.)

33. *LDO*, 20–22.

34. *LDO*, 20: "ut infirmis facti infirmi infirmos lucrentur." Gregory the Great, *Regulae pastoralis liber* 2.5, PL 77:32B-C.

35. In this weakness, they also modeled themselves on Christ, who asked that the Chalice of the Passion pass to someone else. *LDO*, 88. Cf. Matt. 26.43 and Luke 22.42.

and townspeople), but also between spiritual and carnal elements within the individual cleric. For both monks and canons, material concerns were the opportunity to exercise moderation.[36] In the town, a would-be ascetic learned that sin inhered in the appetite for food, not in food itself.[37] Thus, R. could argue that landholding monks like the Cluniacs were not proprietors through greed but through "love of the little ones."[38] By incorporating the marketplace in the edifice of salvation, the *Libellus* mediated not only between warring monks and canons but also among monastic orders that were quarreling over secular contamination.

Likewise, imitation formed the basis of clerical obedience.[39] Ecclesiastical practice in obedience of canon law began as imitation of Christ's activity, especially his burdened ascent to Calvary.[40] The entire clergy bore the cross, but through their replication of his trials some walked closer to Christ.[41] The peace of Christ's body thus ensured that each order served as a foil for the work of the others. Those who lived by the altar must remain pure, for it was they who handled Christ's body.[42] Meanwhile the pastoral activity of others testified to the purity of those inside.[43]

In the *Libellus de diversis ordinibus*, mimesis, transformation, and absorption complete the peaceful body of Christ.[44] The harmony within Christ's body extends from center to periphery and dictates the manner of absorption. The Lord, as the head of this body, calls out to all the others, and the least of

36. *LDO*, 38.

37. *LDO*, 38. Cf. Gregory, *Moralia in Job* 30.60, PL 76:557B. The novice learns to justify himself like David, who quenched his thirst and thanked God, rather than like Esau, who obsessed on his own fasting. *LDO*, 38. Cf. 2 Sam. 23.16 (also known as 2 Kings in some versions of the Bible). Cf. Gen. 25.34.

38. *LDO*, 40.

39. *LDO*, 72. Thus, R. argues, even if Augustine did not write the monastic Rule that bears his name, the fact that it is modeled on his activities makes him its author. Obedience to his Rule is imitation not of Augustine's words so much as his example.

40. *LDO*, 62 and 42.

41. *LDO*, 66. The slow ascent represents the slow rise to priesthood for canons, which begins when they learn humility and obedience through unclean tasks, before they can serve the altar.

42. *LDO*, 68–70: "Si vero munda ea esse oportet sicut etiam in accipiendis ordinibus subdiaconibus iniungitur ut ea munda faciant, quantomagis manus quae corpus Christi conficiunt, tangunt, elevant, portant, amplectuntur, aliis tribuunt, mundae exterius servandae sunt?"

43. *LDO*, 82: "Si igitur omnia haec mundiciam et subtilitatem servorum Dei indicant, quantomagis illorum qui hoc et opere exercent, et habitu vel habitatione testantur?"

44. See *LDO*, 90–92.

members call back.[45] Greater members of the body draw up lesser ones through active participation in the *saeculum*, as represented by the town.[46] No corruption accrues to members living even on the outermost parts of Christ's body, since his flesh shall not see corruption.[47] Thus the church ensures its purity while operating in a material world. Texts like the *Libellus de diversis ordinibus* demonstrate that Christ's body had a dynamic imperative, as did the true peace that it exemplified. True peace allowed internal and external spaces to build each other through mirroring. And despite a pastor's need to mime the weaknesses of his flock, peace also distinguished (and thus protected) the general order of clergy from more worldly communities.

Blessed Peacemakers

As early as the fourth century, John Chrysostom had assigned the most disruptive and intrusive modes of community policing to priests.[48] In their mission to bring peace to all of society, twelfth-century clergy embraced the turbulence that true peacemaking would cause, confident in their own preparation as *pacifici*. Along with the production of avowedly programmatic texts like the *Libellus de diversis ordinibus*, monks and secular clergy expressed this self-imagining in exegesis of apostolic activity, that is, peacemaking in the early days of the Passion. As opposed to the Old Testament, the New Testament inaugurated an age of peace, so that a literal (that is, disjunctive) reading of peace in the synoptic Gospels reveals a message of nonviolence and earthly harmony.[49] Twelfth-century exegetes, however, emphasized in this New Testament peace a mandate for preaching the word among heathens in preparation for the End Times; no part of this peacemaking was gentle. In

45. *LDO*, 86: "sicut et Dominus clamat caput pro membris, nec est absurdum si maius membrum clamet pro minore, sicut non est absurdum maiorem digitum minorem tegere vel defendere."

46. *LDO*, 40, 62, and esp. 86.

47. *LDO*, 70: "'Tale corpus Christi credo, teneo, amplector, sumo, in visceribus interioris mei traicio, et corpus illud intus et exterius, sicut animam eius mundum prae omni mundicia esse pronuntio, et amo circa corpus eius veneration, cuius 'caro non vidit corruptionem.'" Cf. Acts 2.31.

48. T. Sizgorich, *Violence and Belief in Late Antiquity: Militant Devotion in Christianity and Islam* (Philadelphia, 2009), 112.

49. Buc, "Some Thoughts on the Christian Theology of Violence, Medieval and Modern, from the Middle Ages to the French Revolution," *Rivista di storia del Cristianesimo* 5.1 (2008): 11–13, discusses the "structural bias" of Christian theology toward pacifist, that is, disjunctive readings between the Old and New Testament, and the propensity of this structure to allow (conjunctive) expectations of partial or complete fulfillment in displays of violence and coercion that cannot be considered alien to Christian theology.

the Gospel of Matthew, Christ had initiated evangelical ministry by telling his disciples to offer peace in the cities of Galilee. As confirmed in Luke's gospel, this peace was only for men of good will.[50] An oral transmission of peace required that pastors subject recipients to emotional upheaval and redirection of desire, a turbulent conversion likened to exorcism, as when (in Mark's gospel) Christ had driven raging demons out of a possessed youth.[51] With any authentic acceptance of peace, demons of discord would thrash most energetically at the point of their departure, making evangelical peacemaking an aggressive and disruptive process.

All the synoptic Gospels offer images of the evangelist as peacemaker, but Matthew's gospel provided exegetes with the most material for the social and eschatological implications of peace. The evangelical mandate was encapsulated in Christ's instructions to his disciples in Galilee:

> And into whatsoever city or town you shall enter, inquire who in it is worthy, and there abide till you go thence.
>
> And when you come into the house, salute it, saying: Peace be to this house.
>
> And if that house be worthy, your peace shall come upon it; but if it be not worthy, your peace shall return to you.
>
> And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words: going forth out of that house or city shake off the dust from your feet. (Matt. 10.1–14)

These instructions turned the making of peace into an apostolic attribute.[52] In the first half of the twelfth century, when church orders and laypersons were competing for an authentic apostolic mode of regulation and community, the identity of the *pacificus* (peacemaker as well as peaceful) therefore took on a new urgency. Twelfth-century exegetes presented varying typologies of the peacemaker as suited their vision of an apostolic and socially engaged church. As outlined by their particular profession, monks, canons, and bishops all fit the mold of the evangelist peacemaker, but the nature of their gift of peace varied accordingly.

---

50. *Biblia sacra cvm glossis, interlineari, et ordinaria, Nicolai Lyrani postilla ac moralitalibus,* (Venice, 1588), fol. 18v-19 (henceforth *Lyra*): "Haec pax non nisi bona voluntate nutritur, unde Et in terra pax hominibus bonae voluntatis" (Luke 2.14). See also Bruno of Segni, *Sententiae* 2.7, PL 165:922D-923A.

51. Mark 9.17–9.25. See this interpretation of the episode in Gregory the Great, *Homiliae in Hiezechihelem prophetam* 1.12.24, ed. Marcus Adriaen, CCSL 142:197.

52. It is important to qualify apostolic ministry here. Although when enjoined to make peace, Christ's disciples had not received the Paraclete (which is to say the church had not been formally constituted) by means of peace, they would for the first time be conveying the word.

A charge to preach the word, strengthen faith, and convert outsiders covered both monastic and secular clerical notions of peacemaking. When expressing these aspirations, churchmen looked to the apostolic commission to bring peace to every house, but they also sought to know what qualities they themselves must possess in order to successfully convey their peace to others. Here, the Sermon on the Mount provided answers. Jesus's words "Blessed are the peacemakers (*pacifici*)" entrusted those who were already placated within to bring peace to the world by means of word and example. While the number of high medieval commentaries on Matthew cannot compare to those on Psalms, the Song of Songs, or even Genesis, the few written during the early and mid-twelfth century exhibit a striking similarity of purpose, especially as regards the attributes and duties of the *pacificus*. Often, the only variation is the quintessential peacemaker's profession: bishop, monk, or preacher, as dictated by the vocation of the exegete.

Educated in a monastery but trained as a cleric in cathedral schools, Bruno of Segni stands at the crossroads of monastic and clerical worldviews.[53] A cathedral canon of Siena and later a steadfast member of Gregory's reform circle, Bruno focused on scriptural exegesis rather than canon law, making him fairly unusual among Investiture "polemicists." Whereas many in Gregory's curia assembled scriptural and patristic authorities as proof texts for a defense of papal claims, Bruno developed an ecclesiological vision by means of exegetical commentaries.[54] In his *Commentary on Matthew*, the bishop of Segni equated peacemakers with other rectors, especially bishops.[55] When Jesus said, "Blessed are the peacemakers," he meant leaders "who pacify the discordant ones, who reconcile the world to God, who propagate peace

53. William North, "In the Shadows of Reform: Exegesis and the Formation of a Clerical Elite in the Works of Bruno, Bishop of Segni (1078/9–1123)" (PhD diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1998), 19: "A bishop-exegete like Augustine, Ambrose and Gregory the Great, Bruno emerges as a living example of the power of intellectual discourses to cross institutional lives and blur the boundaries between religious lifestyles in the eleventh and twelfth centuries."

54. William North, "Polemic, Apathy, Authorial Initiative in Gregorian Rome: The Curious Case of Bruno of Segni," *Haskins Society Journal* 10 (2001): 117–122. North, "Shadows," 19: "The interpenetration of Bruno's life and works [is] evident in the sources and the fact that Bruno wrote his 'traditional' exegesis as a bishop and an active member of the reform curia."

55. Thanks to scholars such as Ian Robinson and William North, the theologian Bruno of Segni (d. 1123), once ignored, has now emerged as an important political and intellectual exponent of Gregorian reform. Ian S. Robinson, "Political Allegory in the Biblical Exegesis of Bruno of Segni," *RTAM* 50 (1983): 69–98; and North, "Shadows."

and concord between diverse persons."[56] Hence they brought peace to the individual, between individuals in society, and into the relationship between humanity and God. Christ called these peacemakers "sons of God" because "he is our peace who makes both one." Standing in for Christ, they "conjoined separate walls [making] peace between those afar and those close by."[57]

The monk Rupert of Deutz also saw peacemakers standing in for Christ, but rather than rectors, they represented the extension of the Incarnation into the church's last days. Rupert placed the institution of *pacifici* at the hinge of salvation history.[58] By giving up weapons and making themselves helpless, peacemakers inaugurated an era of peace. Not teachers or rulers as much as intercessors, monks more than prelates, they reconciled man and God by virtue of the peace that they shared among themselves:

> Christ sent them, when he rose from the dead and said . . . : "Peace be with you"—"God," they said, "has reconciled us to himself through Christ, and he has given to us the ministry of reconciliation. For Christ, therefore, we are founded as an embassy, as if God is exhorting [you] through us. We entreat for Christ, so that you may be reconciled with God."[59]

Similar to but slightly at odds with Bruno and Rupert, a commentary from the early or middle twelfth century minimizes the pastoral and intercessory roles of the peacemakers, focusing instead on their evangelical commission. The *Enarrationes in evangelium Matthaei* has been attributed to Anselm of Laon (who also compiled the gloss on Matthew), to Bishop Geoffrey Babion

---

56. Bruno of Segni, *Commentaria in Matthaeum*, 1.5.11, PL 165:100A (henceforth *Comm. in Matt.*): "Pacifici enim sunt qui discordes pacificant, qui mundum Deo reconciliant, qui inter caeteros pacem et concordiam seminant."

57. Bruno, *Comm. in Matt.* 1.5.11, 100A.

58. Rupert of Deutz, *De gloria et honore Filii hominis super Mattheum* 4.276–279, ed. Rhaban Haacke, CCCM 29:111: "Postquam autem natus est Christus, *tempus* coepit esse *pacis*, et *tempus sanandi*; quod ministerium priores susceperunt apostoli, et ecce *beati pacifici, quoniam filii Dei vocabuntur* . . . et utique fratres mei." (After Christ was born, *the time* began to be *of peace*, and a *time of healing*; that ministry first the apostles undertook, and behold, blessed are the peacemakers, since they shall be called children of God . . . and mutually my brothers.)

59. Rupert, *Super Mattheum* 4.283–289, 111: "Missi a Christo resurgente a mortuis et dicente, quod antea nusquam dixit semel et iterum ac tertio, secundum Iohannem: *Pax vobis.–Deus*, aiunt, *reconciliavit nos sibi per Christum, et dedit nobis ministerium reconciliationis; quoniam quidem Deus erat in Christo mundum reconcilians sibi, non reputans illis delicta ipsorum, et posuit in nobis verbum reconciliationis. Pro Christo ergo legatione fungimur, tamquam Deo exhortante per nos. Obsecramus pro Christo, reconciliamini Deo.*"

of Bourdeaux, and recently to a third unknown, monastic author.[60] If the author was Babion, as seems to be the majority opinion, then he portrayed *pacifici* consistent with his own vocation: preaching. The bishop Babion that we can authenticate composed widely disseminated sermons, most of which were once ascribed to Hildebert of Lavardin, and even to Saint Augustine.[61] These sermons present the preacher as an *exemplum* to the laity, a role that also defines the *pacificus* in Babion's commentary on Matthew.[62]

As drawn from Matthew, three attributes equipped the *pacificus* to reconcile humanity with itself and with God: exemplary personal discipline, sacerdotal power, and an eschatological commission. Discipline was the primary quality of the peacemaker, exhibited through restraint as well as discretion when it came to worldly affairs. According to the *Ordinary Gloss* the *beati pacifici* of the Sermon on the Mount must be persons who were already peaceful, who had "composed the movements of the soul and subjected them to reason."[63] Since peacemaking began with the senses, the exemplary *pacificus* could not offer the sweetness of peace without rearranging his own tastes. Like those who examined Genesis, exegetes of Matthew agreed that inner peace meant clarified perception.[64] Bruno of Segni noted this injunction in the Epistle to the Hebrews: "Follow peace along with everyone, without

60. For a guide to arguments regarding the attribution of *Enarrationes in Matthaeum*, see Arthur Michael Landgraf, *Introduction à l'histoire de la littérature théologique de la scolastique naissante*, trans. Louis-B. Geiger (Montreal, 1973; Ger. orig. 1948), 71–72. See also regarding the third anonymous monastic author, Damien Van den Eynde, "Autour des 'Enarrationes in Evangelium S. Matthaei' attribuées à Geoffroi Babion," *RTAM* 26 (1959): 50–84. Certainly the putative Babion text has a lot in common with Anselm of Laon's commentary on good will and also appears to borrow heavily from the *Ordinary Gloss* on Matthew. This is one reason that Anselm often appears as the author of the work, even in the manuscript copies. However, similarities between the *Enarrationes* and the *Ordinary Gloss* can be attributed to the prominence of the latter in scriptural exegesis from 1130 onward.

61. See BnF Lat 3810.

62. Geoffrey Babion (sub voce Anselm of Laon), *Enarrationes in evangelium Matthaei* 5, PL 162:1288B-C: "[The blessed peacemakers are called sons of God because] . . . He shall indeed make them likenesses to himself, since they are incorruptible—impassable and incorruptible—and in this way they are concordant, that they will rejoice at the good things of others, as much as (they would) regarding their own." For a discussion of Babion's sermons, see Jean-Hervé Foulon, "Le clerc et son image dans la prédication synodale de Geoffroy Babion, archevêque de Bordeaux (1136–1158)," in *Le clerc séculier au Moyen Âge* (Paris, 1993), 45–60.

63. "Beati pacifici. Rabanus. Pacifici sunt qui omnes motus animi componunt, et rationi subijciunt," attributed to Hrabanus Maurus (d. 856) For this discussion I refer to a printed seven-volume collection, *Lyra* 5, fol. 18v-19. And see Matt. 5.9.

64. See chapter 4 above.

which none will see God" (Heb. 12.14).[65] On the Mount, Christ had likewise counseled his disciples on the importance of taste: "You are the salt of the earth" (Matt. 5.13). Per the *Ordinary Gloss* on Matthew, "These words are said to bishops who are successors of the apostles," with salt signifying discretion.[66] Bruno compared unsavory salt to failed prelates and preachers.[67] However, according to him, "You are the salt" is also a disquisition on peace, referring directly to Christ's teaching, "Have salt among you and peace between you" (Mark 9.5). Salt was a synecdoche for the breaking of bread at meals, and Bruno points out the homonymic connection between Latin *sal* and *salom*, the Hebrew word for "peace." He also seems to make a pun on salt as a condiment, since *condere* means "to conjoin" and *condire* means "to season." Thus Christ meant: "Through your example, you are the conjoining (*condimentum*) of persons; . . . by virtue of your wisdom, others should be schooled; by virtue of your humility and forbearance (*patientia*), they should be composed (*componi*)."[68]

The exemplary role of the *pacifici* meant they must personally have tasted internal peace. While acknowledging the impossibilty of achieving perfect peace on earth—an Augustinian tenet—Geoffrey Babion argued that even in the present, humanity had access to its tokens (*reliquae*). "It is possible to see it," he wrote, "in those who have subdued the illicit movement of the body, who suffer no civil war inside them, but have their rest in spirit in this life."[69] The *pacifici* were examples to which others aspired because they had subjugated within themselves the mortal discord that was reflected in secular society; in fact, they were immune to it and thus able to exercise secular

65. Bruno, *Comm. in Matt.* 1.5.11, 100A: "Apostolus enim dicit: 'Pacem sequimini cum omnibus sine qua nemo videbit Deum'" (Heb. 12.14). Bruno alters the passage to focus on peace. Unaltered, it reads: "Follow peace *and holiness*, without which none shall see God" (emphasis added).

66. *Lyra* 5, fol. 19r: "Vos estis sal, etc. Haec verba dicuntur episcopis qui sunt successores apostolorum. Sal enim in scriptura discretionem significat, quae debet in eis esse per excellentiam, propter quod dicuntur sal in abstracto, sicut excellenter liberalis, liberalitas nominatur. Ipsorum autem discretione debent opera subditorum sic condiri, ut coram Deo sapida reddantur."

67. Bruno, *Comm. in Matt.* 1.5.11, 101A: "Quod si sal evanuerit, si praedicator vires amiserit, si episcopus luxuriae et vanitati se dederit, in quo salietur, in quo populus condietur?" (If the salt evaporates, if the preacher loses his vigor, if the bishop gives himself to lust and vanity, in whom will the populace be seasoned, in whom will it be made savory?)

68. Bruno, *Comm. in Matt.* 1.5.11, 101A: "Vos estis hominum condimentum, vestro exemplo instruit, vestra sapientia doceri, vestra humilitate et patientia componi caeteri debent."

69. Babion, *Enarrationes* 5, 1288C: "sed tamen aliquae reliqiae dantur in presenti, quod potest videri in illis, qui ita habent sedatos illicitos motus corporis, quod nullum civile bellum patiuntur in se, sed habet anima requiem suam in hac vita."

leadership. To Babion, King Solomon was the exemplary *pacificus*, for "in him are sedated all illicit motives of the body; and as if already placed in eternal tranquility, he is able to say along with the Apostle: 'Our dealing (*conversatio*) is in the heavens'" (Phil. 3.20).[70]

While it is simplistic to distinguish too broadly between monastic and clerical interpretations of the evangelical peacemaker, monks do appear to have been less optimistic about the possibility of achieving an internal peace sufficient to justify abandoning the contemplative mode for the active one. The Cistercian Bernard of Clairvaux insisted that only those already pacified were able to convey peace in the world, but warned that many would attempt to make peace without being peaceful themselves.[71] Rupert of Deutz saw peacemaking more as a prayerful intercession between God and humanity in which the mediators must remain as pure as possible from secular engagement, or, in other words, strangers to bloodshed. Therefore, while discernment was one aspect of emotional discipline, another was restraint. As extensions of the Incarnation in history, Rupert's peacemakers must follow a monastic mode: a life of passivity and propitiation, wherein the daily sacraments provided the framework for redemption and reform.[72]

For Rupert, the *pacifici* sustained peace on earth because they exemplified the Sabbath.[73] They were the culmination of God's plan to reverse the effects of the Fall, the recreation of the world through the Incarnation of the Prince of Peace. Before this hinge in universal history, there was a time of killing (*tempus occidendi*), when bloodshed and the use of weapons were permissible in order to defend the house of David. Once the Davidic family tree bore fruit in Jesus, there was no longer the same need, and it became a time for preserving life (*tempus salvandi*).[74] "Following this," he says, "absolutely on no occasion did they lay hands on weapons of war, except . . . that spiritual

---

70. Babion, *Enarrationes* 1, 1243A: "Tunc enim in eo sedati sunt omnes motus illiciti, et quasi iam in aeterna tranquillitate positus, potest cum Apostolo dicere: *Nostra conversatio in coelis est*" (Phil. 3.20).

71. Bernard of Clairvaux, *Ad clericos de conversione*, in *Sämtliche Werke* 4, ed. G. Winkler and H. Brem (Innsbruck, 1992), 110: "Vae filiis irae, qui pacificorum sibi usurpare gradus et nomina non verentur! Vae filiis irae, qui fideles sese mediatores pacis, ut peccata populi comedant, mentiuntur!" (Woe the sons of anger who usurp for themselves the rank and names of peacemakers that they do not merit! Woe the sons of anger who misrepresent themselves as faithful mediators of peace so that they may feed from the sins of the people!) Cf. *Sermo* 98, in *Sermones de diversis*, PL 183:725C-726B.

72. John Van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz* (Berkeley, 1983), 365–368.

73. Rupert, *Super Mattheum* 4.289–290, 111: "Et nota quod in ordine beatitudinum septimo loco sabbatismus pacis est."

74. Rupert, *Super Mattheum* 4.257–263, 110.

sword, which is *the sermon of God, living and efficacious, and more penetrating than any double-edged sword*" (Heb. 4.12).[75] Preaching, while permitted, was only an extension of inner discipline and restraint from weapons. While all other groups that Christ blessed might be permitted to use a military sword, the *pacifici* must use only God's word. This restraint enabled the *pacifici* to extend the fruits of salvation to others, since only they had the power to reconcile God and humanity.

The role of inner discipline excited a debate within the Western church; it engaged the polemical talents of Rupert himself, and later Anselm of Havelberg and Bernard of Clairvaux. Anselm's career as regular canon, legate, bishop, and imperial courtier epitomizes the activity and growing secular engagement of church orders during a century in which peace became a call to pastoral and political activity. As papal legate, Anselm led an expedition against pagan Slavs during the Second Crusade. The stated purpose of this "Wendish Crusade" was conversion—forcible or otherwise—a departure from previous crusading projects that had been presented as a defense of the Holy Land and its pilgrims.[76] Anselm described and defended his *vita activa* in writing.[77] Trained as a Premonstratensian canon, he held evangelism to be the defining attribute of the apostolic life and claimed this mandate for all canons regular based on their balancing of active and contemplative modes.[78]

For churchmen who valued the active mode, inner pacification was not only preparation but also defense. The Cistercian William of Saint-Thierry

---

75. Rupert, *Super Mattheum* 4.246–249, 110: "Nusquam omnino deinceps arma belli attrectaverunt, nisi gladium illum gladium spiritualem, qui est *sermo Dei vivus et efficax, et penetrabilior omni gladio ancipiti*." Also cf. Matt. 10.34.

76. Pegatha Taylor, "Moral Agency in Crusade and Colonization: Anselm of Havelberg and the Wendish Crusade of 1147," *International History Review* 22.4 (Dec. 2000): 757–783. J. Phillips, *The Second Crusade: Extending the Frontiers of Christendom* (New Haven, CT, 2007), 235–239, explores Bernard of Clairvaux's "puzzling" call for a Crusade in which nothing short of conversion should satisfy God's soldiers. He suggests that Pope Eugenius's attempts to temper Bernard's language may have contributed to a somewhat-muddled intent among the final Baltic expeditionary force.

77. Lees, *Anselm of Havelberg*, 129–131. In 1138, Anselm left imperial service for Magdeburg, formerly the archdiocese of his mentor, Norbert of Xanten. The return coincided with the decision of a canon, Peter of Hamersleben, to become a monk at Huysburg abbey, southwest of Magdeburg, and with a spate of letters from the abbot Egbert extolling this choice. Anselm responded with his *Epistola apologetica*, which placed the life of a canon above that of a monk (Lees, 54–55, 134).

78. See Taylor, "Anselm and the Wendish Crusade," 766–767; Lees, *Anselm of Havelberg*, 141–161. According to Ott, such balance also guides the *vita* of Lietbert of Cambrai, where the author models his pastor on Gregory the Great. John S. Ott, "'Both Mary and Martha': Bishop Lietbert of Cambrai and the Construction of Episcopal Sanctity in a Border Diocese around 1100," in *The Bishop Reformed: Studies of Episcopal Power and Culture in the Central Middle Ages*, ed. John S. Ott and Anna Trumbore Jones (Aldershot, UK, 2007), 137–160.

saw inner peace as a shield against *curiositas*, that is, a filter by means of which monks could live in the world without succumbing to its delights and concerns. His fellow Cistercian Aelred of Rievaulx agreed that recent converts were seriously affected by "concupiscence of the eyes."[79] But evangelists like Anselm saw additional advantages to internalized and ultimately victorious moral conflict. Once they had ended an internal civil war, by dint of their good will, the *pacifici* could bear the travails of an earthly ministry. Armed against *curiositas*, canons could work in the world in order to transform others. However, because of the seamless transition between self and society in peacemaking theology, a war against carnality could easily manifest itself beyond personal morality and into the sphere of social and political conflict. What began within the disciplined self could be extended outward in the form of an evangelical Crusade.[80] The sacramental and eschatological connotations of Christian peacemaking underwrote this mandate for complete upheaval.

The Offer of Peace

In the twelfth century, divinity condescended to the mortal plane not only in the sacrament but also in the sermon. Word and word had become essential to humanity's redemption, and a bond of peace formed through proper reception. Offers of peace therefore constructed a subject, setting up choices that defined the individual in terms of eternal reward or punishment. After Christ asked his disciples to brush off the dust of cities that refused peace, he added a chilling warning: "I say to you, let it be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the Day of Judgment than for that city" (Matt. 10.15). The bringers of peace thus also served as harbingers of judgment and destruction. For Rupert of Deutz the apostolic offer of peace meant: "Those graced should rejoice, those not should fear."[81] Peacemaking clarified the predestination of the saved: "For [even as] peace rests upon these, upon those others the anger of heaven rages, according to the example of the

79. Aelred of Rievaulx, *De speculo caritatis*, ed. A. Hoste and C. H. Talbot, CCCM 1:99–101 (henceforth *De spec. car.*).

80. Anselm of Havelberg, *Epistola apologetica*, PL 188:1136D: "Non sibi, sed Deo strenue militans . . . plures ex gentibus legibus Christi tanquam bellator fortis subjiciens"; Taylor, "Anselm and the Wendish Crusade," 767.

81. Rupert, *Super Mattheum* 8.750, 248: "Hoc est, quod gaudere grati, quod timere debent ingrati."

Sodomites and the Gomorrhans."[82] Lot, who was rescued from Sodom, had welcomed God's avenging angels to his home, just as those worthy of peace would receive the apostles, making themselves available for divine grace.[83] Because he made a feast and baked unleavened bread the angelic peace came upon him and his family.[84] His personal effort was instrumental in bringing peace upon his house.[85]

With its mixed Jewish and gentile population, Galilee became the New Testament proving ground for the Lot prophecy. The apostolic peace conveyed by the word condemned and demarcated those who would not accept grace: a sin of improper reception, analogous to sacramental inefficacy. While he praised the gentiles of Galilee for celebrating peace, Rupert condemned the Jews not only for being deaf to peace but also for murdering it, as he believed unworthy recipients did a sacrament.[86] Like Jerusalem in the book of Lamentations, the Jews surrendered themselves despite being offered a

82. Rupert, *Super Mattheum* 8.751–754, 248: "Nam super istos requiescit pax, super illos caelestis secundum exemplum Sodomorum et Gomorraeorum irruit ira." According to John Van Engen, an emphasis on predestination runs throughout Rupert's commentary on Matthew. Van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz*, 355.

83. Rupert, *Super Mattheum* 8.758–761, 248: "Non expectavit ille, videlicet Loth, ut illi hospitium postularent aut interrogarent, qui in domo eius essent digni hospitibus tantis, sed obviam vadens et adorans, obsecravit, et obsecrando compulit, ut ad eum diverterent." (Lot did not wait for the angels to ask for hospitality, or for them to query who in his house was deserving of such guests, but he went out to meet them, prostrated himself, and beseeched them. So beseeching he compelled the angels to divert from their path [and come] to his house.)

84. Rupert, *Super Mattheum* 8.761–763, 248.

85. As a host, Lot foreshadows those worthy of the apostles' peace, for "upon [his household] a certain peace rested, while upon the Sodomites and Gomorrans anger came, namely of fiery and sulphuric rain, that destroyed them." Rupert, *Super Mattheum* 8.768–770, 248–249: "Ita super eum pax quaedam requievit, super Sodomam autem et Gomorram ira venit, scilicet ignis et sulphuris pluvia, quae illos subvertit."

86. Rupert says the church of the gentiles responded eagerly to the apostles of Christ, saying, "*Peace to this house*, peace apostolic, peace Christ Himself, just as for instance, they said, *He Himself is our peace,* He came and He rested." *Super Mattheum* 8.777–778, 249: "*Pax huic domui*, pax apostolica, pax ipse Christus, quemadmodum dicunt, *ipse est pax nostra*, venit et requievit." See Eph. 2.14. On the other hand, for the Jews, that is, for "those citizens of the earthly Jerusalem—indeed of Sodom and of Gomorrah—who did not receive this peace, and not only did they not receive, *they also crucified the truth*, the whole earth has heard in what way they ruin, and in the day of judgment there is no doubt but that a judgment shall be more intolerable [against them] than against the sin of the Sodomites" (emphasis added). Rupert, *Super Mattheum* 8.778–783, 249: "Illi autem civitati terrenae Hierusalem, immo Sodomae atque Gomorrae, quae pacem istam non recepit, nec solum non recepit, verum etiam crucifixit, qualiter iam acciderit totus orbis audivit, et in die iudicii nulli dubium est; quin iudicandum sit peccatum eius intolerabilius peccato Sodomorum." The words "the whole earth hears" may be an allusion to the condemnation of Cain, when the earth itself rose up as a witness against the fratricide. See Gen. 4.10–11.

fighting chance for redemption.[87] According to Rupert, this was why Christ told his apostles to expunge from themselves the dust of unworthy cities.

In the early twelfth century, a debate still raged over whether unworthy recipients polluted the sacraments; Rupert had been an energetic participant. The associations between evangelism and conferral of the sacrament meant that the same concerns for purity affected preachers, who walked among sinners offering peace through the word of God. Geoffrey Babion argued that even in divided Galilee the peacemaker must offer word and Word as a sacrament to all. Ministers of peace could "shake off the dust" of the unworthy (Matt. 10.14), since "after [sinners] have refused to hear spiritual things, nothing material should be received from these persons, even if it is offered."[88] The fact that communities in Galilee washed the feet of the apostles taught that a receptive audience would remove any sins that a preacher might have picked up by association with sinners. Even those who had preached in vain were not condemned to keep that dust, for they shook it off in the faces of those who did not listen.[89] This assurance to preachers also appears in a collection of sermons by Babion.[90]

Turbulence before Tranquility: The Eschatology of Peace

The words "Peace to this house" had emblematized the energetic reform projects of Pope Leo IX in 1049. Within a hundred years, reform had expanded in two ways. Firstly, it no longer simply legislated the protection of the sacraments but instead targeted subjective transformations for which sacramental efficacy was testimony. Secondly, where Leo had contented

87. Rupert, *Super Mattheum* 8.783–786, 249: "quemadmodum et Hieremias in Lamentationibus dicit: *Et maior effecta est iniquitas filiae populi mei peccato Sodomorum, quae subversa est in momento et non ceperunt in ea manus*." (And the punishment for the iniquity of the daughter of my people [i.e., Jerusalem] is greater than the sin of the Sodomites, that she was overthrown in a moment, and hands did not lay hold in [i.e., of] her" [Lam. 4.6].)

88. Babion, *Enarrationes* 10, 1342D: "Excussio enim pulveris significat, quod nihil ab eis recipi debet terrenum, etiamsi offertur, postquam spiritualia audire nolunt."

89. The dust that initially clung to the feet of the peacemaker must be interpreted as "venial sins, which adhere to preachers while they are passing (or crossing) through the world." Babion, *Enarrationes* 10, 1342D: "Pulvis quoque in pedibus, venialia significat peccata, quae adhaerent praedicatoribus transeuntibus per mundum."

90. BnF Lat 3810, fol. 25–25v, cataloged as a "homiliary," with verses from Hildebert of Lavardin and sermons probably from Geoffrey Babion. The flyleaf simply reads: "Aliquos Sermones de Sanctis." An erased anathema clause on fol. 1 suggests that this collection was passed around, perhaps even beyond the confines of the house that owned it.

himself with sending legates to excommunicate an incredulous Byzantine patriarch, twelfth-century reformers gave themselves a brief for large-scale conversion, the rhythms of which would measure time until the Apocalypse. Pope Eugenius III and Bernard of Clairvaux even promoted a Crusade for the conversion of pagan Slavs, undergirded by apocalyptic expectations for a united Christendom before the coming of Antichrist.[91] Unlike Crusades to the Holy Land, the evangelical goal meant that only one form of peace was acceptable—the peace conveyed by Matthew's *pacifici*. As the architect of this venture, Bernard wrote a general "letter to the faithful" insisting that they desist from making any pacts with their opponents without a prior transformation of souls.[92]

Eschatology framed, and in some cases fueled, the pastoral enterprise within Christian Europe and in pagan or semipagan territories beyond.[93] For twelfth-century commentators, an episode in Matthew's gospel explained how wars of conversion would mark the culmination of God's plan for humanity. While performing miracles in Galilee, Jesus and his disciples crossed the Dead Sea in a boat. A tempest overtook them, and as the disciples looked around in terror, they noticed that their master was asleep:

> And they came to him, and awaked him, saying: "Lord save us, we perish."
>
> And Jesus said to them: "Why are you fearful, O ye of little faith?" Then rising up he commanded the winds, and the sea, and there was a great calm (*tranquilitas*). (Matt. 8.23–27)

Even though the word *pax* is conspicuously absent in this passage, exegetes associated Christ calming the waters with him restoring the peace of the church. Geoffrey Babion in fact wrote *pax* instead of *tranquilitas* in his rendition of Matthew 8.27; possibly by force of habit, a copyist wrote *tranquilitas* before canceling it out and writing *pax*.[94] Bruno of Segni explained that by sedating fear at the level of the soul, Christ made "a great peace *and*

---

91. Taylor, "Moral Agency," 769–773, describes how Eugenius negotiated around Bernard's more insistent Apocalyptic expectations in the bull *Divina dispensatione*, which associated the Wendish expedition with the Second Crusade.

92. Bernard of Clairvaux, *Ep.* 457, in *Opera*, vol. 8: *Epistolae extra corpus*, ed. J. Leclercq and H. Rochais (Rome, 1977), 432–433.

93. See Brett Whalen, *Dominion of God: Christendom and Apocalypse in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2009).

94. BnF Lat. 624, fol. 64v.

tranquility."[95] And Rupert of Deutz summed up the incident: "Once the Lord had risen up following a great movement, 'tranquility was made,' and peace returned to the churches."[96]

The tempest at sea, winds and rocking waves, represented a movement and countermovement that contained the entire history of the church. Bruno, Babion, and Rupert all agreed that the storms signified persecutions. In the tradition of the Gregorian reform, Bruno meant the sufferings of communities under illicit pastors, sheep ruled by wolves. Rupert associated persecution with the tyranny of princes, beginning with Nero and continuing until the end of the world.[97] Nero and Diocletian constituted the "winds of the *saeculum*" that the devil had excited. Their violence resembled "a turbulent tempest that had thundered and vehemently disturbed the very ship of the church, while Jesus was sleeping, almost to the point of peril to life and health."[98] Jesus's sleep signified a seeming withdrawal of divine grace from the church; the weak in faith were becoming frightened and impatient. However, God would not suffer iniquity too long on the just, and the awakened Christ was a terrible reminder to the church's enemies of vengeance to come.[99]

Thinkers who agreed with Rupert's eschatological reading of the tempest nonetheless differed over the implications of Christ's awakening. To some, pure peace meant not judgment in the afterlife but conversion and renewal within earthly time. Gerhoh of Reichersberg tied the wind and waves explicitly to four great persecutions: emperors, heretics, corruption, and Antichrist. The church had already been rocked by three of the four, the third represented by the papacy of Hadrian IV and his adviser Roland Bandinelli (Alexander III).

---

95. Bruno, *Comm. in Matt.* 2.8.27, 145D: "Quotidie quidem rugit, quotidie bella sedat, quotidie visibilibus et invisibilibus imperat . . . fit pax et tranquillitas magna."

96. Rupert, *Super Mattheum* 7.1081–1083, 224: "Surgente Domino post magnos motus, *facta est tranquillitas* et pax ecclesiis reddita est." Cf. Bonizo of Sutri, *Liber ad amicum* 2, MGH LDL 1:573: "Igitur Constantino a Silvestro sanctae Romanae aecclesiae episcopo baptizato . . . reddita est pax in toto orbe aecclesiis; quamvis non longo tempore duratura." The end of Roman persecutions can be seen as a shadow of future peace, since even this period of calm was disrupted by heresies.

97. Bruno, *Comm. in Matt.* 2.8.27, 145A: "The pastor indeed seems to sleep, when wolves rage among the sheep, when thieves rob, and there is no one who tears [them] away." Rupert, *Super Mattheum* 7.1015–1019, 222–224.

98. Rupert, *Super Mattheum* 7.1015–1019, 222: "ut manifestae persecutionis violentia per magnos principes in gentibus, quasi per magnos ventorum motus in mari tempestas excitata detonaret ipsamque ecclesiae naviculam quasi dormiente Iesu paene usque ad periculum vitae et salutis vehementer vexaret."

99. Rupert, *Super Mattheum* 7.1057–1050, 223.

The boat on the waves was the true church, containing only the faithful.[100] After a final onslaught, Christ would rise up and calm the wind and waves, inaugurating an era of pure peace and delight before the end. Geoffrey Babion read the tempest anagogically, as hope for the constitution of a new church.[101] The tempest foreshadowed the great turbulence of the Passion; the sleep of Christ prefigured his death.[102] The quieting of winds and water demonstrated peace brought to communities through faith in an ultimate resurrection. The disciples, "shaken by His death, with utmost prayers sought His resurrection," saying that they would perish through the resultant turbulence.[103]

In these sequences of renewal, turbulence played an equal part with tranquility. Jesus cast his disciples on a sea of troubles so that they would request his aid.[104] The tempest—a temporary disturbance of the peace—created two societies, one of faith and the other of disbelief. Babion says the disciples were young and feared their own fragility, since Christ "had not yet confirmed them through the passion, resurrection, and ascension, nor in the descent of the Spirit Paraclete."[105] When he rebuked them, Christ meant them to realize the following: "Who believes less is confuted, and who does not believe is scorned, the fragile in faith are reproached, [and] completely placed as alien to the faith, as pagans, heretics."[106] The faithful transcended with Christ "the currents of the world."[107] In contrast to the immediate

100. Gerhoh of Reichersberg, *De quarta vigilia noctis* 12, ed. E. Sackur, MGH LDL 3:511.

101. Henri de Lubac, *Medieval Exegesis: The Four Senses of Scripture*, trans. E. M. Macierowski, (Grand Rapids, MI, 2000), 2:181, will confirm this as the anagogic sense, in that it refers to a building up of hope for future rewards of faith, both within the context of the disciples' own ministry and in terms of a renewed church to come.

102. Babion, *Enarrationes* 8, 1325A: "Cum ergo Christus positus fuisset in cruce, motus magnus factus est, quia commotae sunt mentes discipulorum de eius passione, et navicula operta est fluctibus, quia tota vis persecutionis circa Christi crucem fuit, ubi scilicet in morte occubuit." (When Christ was placed on the cross, a great movement was generated, since the minds of the disciples were in commotion regarding His passion, and the boat was engaged with the currents, since the total force of persecution was around the cross of Christ, namely when He lay in death.)

103. Babion, *Enarrationes* 8, 1325A: "Excitant discipuli Dominum, dum turbati morte maximus votis resurrectionem quaerunt dicentes: *Domine, salva nos* resurgendo, quia perimus turbatione tuae mortis."

104. Babion, *Enarrationes* 8, 1324B.

105. Babion, *Enarrationes* 8, 1324C: "Discipuli qui adhuc parvuli et infirmi erant, necdum plenarie robusti, nondum enim eos confirmaverat passio Domini, resurrectio, et ascensio, nec descensio Spiritus Paracleti."

106. Babion, *Enarrationes* 8, 1324C-D: "Qui pusillum credit arguitur, et qui non credit contemnitur, fragiles in fide corripiuntur, omnino a fide alieni ponuntur, ut pagani, haeretici."

107. Babion, *Enarrationes* 8, 1324D.

danger of the tempest, the peace of the church was the promise of eternal security, understood through the Resurrection. By his return from the tomb, Christ rebuked his followers for their hardness of heart and disbelief, saying that it was necessary that Christ suffer in order to enter his glory, so as to defeat the devil's pride. In this way, says Babion, he "expelled the furor of the Jews, and great peace occurred, since the minds of the apostles were calmed once they had glimpsed the Resurrection."[108]

The restoration of peace signified the institution of a church and ecclesial leadership but simultaneously looked forward to the final revelation of the eternal kingdom. Christ's peace amid worldly turmoil was a vision of life at hand and life to come. It defined all occasions when "the general Church [was] vexed in the currents of its age (*saeculum*) and through great persecutions."[109] After patient suffering and stability, those who still heeded Christ's sermon were *pacifici*, tranquil in mind and faithful to the earthly and celestial destiny of the church. Honorius Augustodunensis saw this time of peace as a final Easter, in which the flame of the Holy Spirit would be rekindled: the lapsed would make penance, and Jews and infidels would enter the church.[110] The steps to the achievement of this Sabbath were symbolized by the sequence of Christ's death and resurrection.

Even though it came about in a time of peace, the church's renewal required a watering in blood. Promising both destruction and delight, the peace of end times had a schizophrenic nature. As the history of the world—a history of persecution—unfolded, so too did a parallel, unseen history of triumphant warfare on the persecutors. While tyrants ruled, the church had been quieted in an illusory peace—subjugated but not pacified. But even as they suffered physically, the faithful were guaranteed spiritual security so that they may put themselves in harm's way unconcerned. According to Bruno, "I send you as sheep amid the wolves" told the *pacifici* what they would encounter, and how they should react: "You go for the sake of suffering; preserve forbearance and innocence. You do not defend yourselves, since you are sheep; they rage, since they are wolves."[111]

---

108. Babion, *Enarrationes* 8, 1325B: "vesaniam Judaeorum dejecit, et facta est magna pax, quia sedatae sunt mentes apostolorum visa resur(r)ectione."

109. Babion, *Enarrationes* 8, 1325B: "Possumus etiam per naviculam generalem Ecclesiam intelligere, quae in fluctibus huius saeculi vexatur, et magnis persecutionibus."

110. See Whalen, *Dominion of God*, 94–95.

111. Bruno, *Comm. in Matt.* 2.10.38, 161A: "Ad patiendum itis; patiendum et innocentiam custodite. Non vos defendatis, quia oves estis; saeviant illi, quia lupi sunt."

The longer the Lord seemed to sleep, the greater would be the upheaval brought about by his awakening. "For the Lord Jesus to rise," wrote Rupert of Deutz, "and [for him] to command the winds and the sea, is to exercise and unleash his power, for the sake of assisting the elect and for taking vengeance against the reprobate."[112] Peace arrived after suffering, loss of faith, and the ultimate defeat of Antichrist and his followers. Martyrs received this vision of peace when persecution against them was greatest.[113] God's final act of peacemaking was the Last Judgment, when "the earth trembled and was still" (Ps. 75.9–10), that is, "when the impious will fear and stop persecuting the saints."[114] The tempest in Matthew thus conveyed the essence of evangelical peacemaking: "wisdom sown in fear."[115]

Evangelical Peacemaking and Ecclesiastical Expansion

Typical of a twelfth-century exegete committed to the *vita activa*, Geoffrey Babion read Jesus's genealogy in the Gospel of Matthew as a blueprint for church offices, culminating in the office of the peacemaker. In the *Enarrationes*, the type for the *pacificus* is King Solomon, in whose line Jesus claimed descent. While Abraham prefigures Christ the servant and Isaac the sacrifice, David refers to "'the strong-armed one,' who forcefully struggled against and subjugated" foreign enemies.[116] Thus, the strong arm "should subjugate to God carnal men, through word and example, like Paul, who converted the gentiles."[117] On the heels of this aggressive official is Solomon, "who is interpreted '*pacificus*.'"[118] Solomon "became *pacificus* since he served God, and converted others to God": in short he is the type for the evangelist.[119]

112. Rupert, *Super Mattheum* 7.1062–1065, 223: "Dominum Iesum surgere, ventisque et mari imperare, est potentiam suam exercere sive excitare, scilicet, ad adiuvandum electos et ad vindicandum in reprobos."

113. Rupert, *Super Mattheum* 7.1074–1081, 223–224.

114. Rupert, *Super Mattheum* 7.1073–1074, 223: "tunc terra tremet et quiescet, id est impii timebunt et sanctos persequi desinent."

115. Cf. Hugh of Saint-Victor, *De archa Noe* 3.2, ed. P. Sicard, CCCM 176:55: "Primo igitur ibi de sapientia dictum est quod per timorem seminatur"; and Prov. 1.7.

116. Babion, *Enarrationes* 1, 1243A: "id est *manu fortis*, qui contra hostes fortiter dimicavit, et alienigenas Idumaeos tributarios fecit."

117. Babion, *Enarrationes* 1, 1243A: "Similiter ipse debet carnales homines verbo et exemplo Deo subjugare, sicut Paulus, qui gentes convertit, qui per Idumaeos designantur."

118. Babion, *Enarrationes* 1, 1243A; and 1241D: "Salamon, quasi Salemon a sale, quod est pax."

119. Babion, *Enarrationes* 1, 1243A: "tunc enim ille fit pacificus cum Deo servit, et alios ad Deum convertit."

However, the evangelist is no less aggressive than his strong-armed predecessor. Solomon, the type for the evangelist, was also an exorcist, who would cause a turbulent, internal metamorphosis.[120]

While exorcism was peacemaking through the forceful expulsion of latent violence, a complete transformation of sensibilities and desires could take place only in the sacrament. The church's peace was a universal communion, and accordingly, evangelical peacemaking took on the outlines of the sacrament. Essential to sacramental transformation was detachment of the self from its prior sensations and loves so as to discover and delight in the revelation of the Word. Corporeal elements, sacramental stimuli, and sensory interfaces initiated this transformative process. Medieval missionary activity combined the exorcistic and sacramental qualities of Matthew's peacemakers.

Early twelfth-century churchmen recognized the political realities of conveying peace to the hostile, reluctant, and alienated. The Second Crusade and the accompanying mission to the Wends bore out the militant and regenerative promise of eschatological peacemaking. The unapologetically militant character of this expedition laid crusaders and their instigator, Bernard of Clairvaux, open to the charge of forced baptism.[121] Jay T. Lees has argued that evangelists like Anselm of Havelberg participated only reluctantly, believing warfare against the Wends to be incompatible with the injunction to spread God's word. The bishop of Havelberg served both as papal legate and as imperial watchdog; Lees presents him as a pawn in a battle of wills between Pope Eugenius III and Bernard, and in the political maneuvers between Emperor Conrad III and his unreliable ally Albert the Bear.[122] The Wendish Crusade was an embarrassing failure, and Anselm retreated from an active to an ascetic mode, perhaps alarmed at the political dust that clings to the sandals of evangelists.[123]

Of course churchmen had embraced a policy of disruptive and coercive conversion well in advance of the Wendish Crusade.[124] In 1122, the pioneering

120. Babion describes Solomon as an exorcist, a reference to his legendary dealings with demons. *Enarrationes* 12, 1361A: "Apud Judaeos erant exorcistae, qui per exorcismos a Salomone inventos, saepe daemonia ab obsessis corporibus ejiciebant. Vere ego ejicio potentia divina ab hominibus daemones, quia filii vestri ejiciunt in virtute Dei."

121. Taylor, "Moral Agency," 758–760.

122. Lees, *Anselm of Havelberg*, 74–78.

123. Taylor, "Moral Agency," 778–779, suggests that Anselm retreated to an ascetic rather than pastoral spiritual enterprise in the aftermath of the Wendish Crusade, to replace the perils of secular living with the hardship of life on the pagan frontier.

124. Eric Christiansen, *The Northern Crusades*, 2nd, new ed. (London, 1997), 50–59.

missionary Otto of Bamberg had to ally with ruthless warlords, using terror as a precursor to transformation in Pomerania. Otto and his entourage were working to convert pagan Slavs from the cults of powerful local gods like Triglav. But before the Word could be conveyed in all its sweetness, Satanic forces must be defeated to prevent interference.[125] According to Otto's biographers, the devil was everywhere, lurking in the most innocent and seemingly harmonious friendships on the distant Baltic frontiers of the Christian world. Wherever they went, the evangelists met prominent Christians who had defaulted thanks to long associations with pagans; baptized children risked their souls playing alongside infidels.[126] The Slavs were obsessed with money and material benefit, to such an extent that the saintly Otto had to stoop to bribery and coercion, clothing himself in secular attractions despite his renunciation of the flesh. But in the midst of these negotiations between carnal means and spiritual ends, and despite disrupting every society he entered, Otto presented himself predominantly as a peacemaker.

Detailed narratives of Otto's Pomeranian missions appear only from 1158, twenty years after the bishop's death and thirty-six years after his first expedition into the Baltic.[127] It may be that the Wendish Crusade and the formation of the order of Teutonic Knights reshaped the recollections of the authors Herbord of Michelsberg and Ebbo, for the general tenor of their accounts is militant in all senses of the word. The aim of twelfth-century evangelists was to bring peace by means of the sword—disturbance as a means to tranquility. Two Christian dukes, Boleslav of Polonia and Wortizlav of Pomerania, were trying to gain political footholds in the pagan Baltic. Boleslav aimed to either force conversion or exterminate any pagan Pomeranians who remained intransigent. His forces had killed eighteen thousand pagan warriors and captured eight thousand others along with their families. He installed his prisoners on the borderlands of his kingdom and, according to Herbord's account, tried to win them over as recruits against his enemies; this meant converting them to Christianity, a condition of liberation, and tributary

125. Christiansen, *Northern Crusades*, 57.

126. Herbord of Michelsberg, *Vita et perigrinatio Ottonis episcopi* 2.28, ed. R. Koepke, MGH SS 12:792. Book 2 (the first mission) is presented as a dialogue between Sefridus, the primary narrator, and Tiemo, who seems to share knowledge of the events. See also Herbord, *Dialogus de vita Ottonis episcopi Babenbergensis* 2.29, ed. J. Wikarjak and K. Liman, Monumenta Poloniae Historica, Series Nova 4 (Warsaw, 1974), 117–118. Unless indicated otherwise (as *Dialogus*), reference is to the MGH edition.

127. Ebbo of Michelsberg, *Vita Ottonis episcopi Bambergensis*, ed. R. Koepke, MGH SS 12:822–883. The accounts do acknowledge a debt to an earlier unknown author.

status.[128] The evangelizing bishop Otto therefore entered Pomerania with an armed escort, and protected by peace agreements arranged between the dukes and various towns over which they maintained a tentative hold.[129]

Accounts of Otto's mission acknowledge the evangelist's use of all available secular devices toward ecclesial benefit. Otto was an imperial bishop, and like Adalbero of Metz and Bruno of Toul in previous centuries, his pastoral enterprise was notable for its use of material and political advantage, duly explained and excused by his biographers. However, while the biographers of Adalbero and his collaborator John of Gorze show men torn between spiritual and material concerns, and repeatedly chastised by their saint for overbalancing into the secular, Otto's biographers have no such doubts. Whereas the *vita* of Bishop Bruno has him enter Rome garbed in pilgrim rags, stories of Bishop Otto emphasize that a demonstration of material prestige was essential to projects of spiritual reform in the Baltic. Otto lured the pagan Slavs with gold, gifts, and political security, material tokens of the power of God's word.[130] In the pope's name the mission also sought assistance from Duke Wortizlav of Pomerania, a Christian who lived on uneasy terms with pagans in his land.[131] While offering him the peace of Christ, they conferred gifts on the duke to make it easier for him to attract locals to the faith: the carrot rather than the stick.[132] In turn, Wortizlav provided military assistance against pagan priests who incited attacks on the missionaries.

When missionaries like Otto embraced aspects of the *vita activa* that might seem to conflict with their spiritual enterprise, they cited a simple formula: speak in the language of the audience. Of course Otto and his companions selected preachers who knew the local language and were familiar with local customs, but they also enlisted ducal armies and exaggerated their own wealth and grandeur, because, as Ebbo argues, material bombast was essential

128. Herbord, *Vita Ottonis* 2.5, 777.

129. Herbord, *Vita Ottonis* 2.23, 788–789.

130. Herbord, *Vita Ottonis* 2.28, 791–792. Otto used gold and fine clothes to lure two youths and their mother toward spiritual riches. This approach, so successful with children and women, also came into play with adult pagans, although in the case of the fiercest and most stubborn, Otto left it up to divine grace to effect an emotional transformation. See below with regard to Domizlav, father of the two youths mentioned here.

131. Herbord, *Vita Ottonis* 2.11, 780, asserts that Wortizlav had to conquer his fear of pagans when he greeted the Christian bishop with genuine affection. And Ebbo, *Vita Ottonis* 2.9, 849 testifies to Wortizlav's lack of control over the region of Stettin.

132. Ebbo, *Vita Ottonis* 2.4, 846.

to produce an initial draw for those whose spiritual senses had not yet developed.[133] Not having yet received the transformative gifts of conversion, the pagan Slavs still allowed carnality to rule their judgment. They would not honor a previous missionary, Bernard, because he was a simple man, and Bernard had eventually asked that a bishop-courtier be sent in his place.[134]

Not surprisingly, warfare and political coercion appear frequently in accounts of Otto's mission. They are embraced rather than avoided—most likely because they could not *be* avoided. The missionaries regularly faced assaults from a pagan populace that considered their intrusion a violation of pacts previously made with the dukes of Polonia and Pomerania; the monks' hasty retreats bear the marks of military strategy.[135] In a region where Dukes Boleslav and Wortizlav were competing for footholds, the evangelical enterprise often provided the occasion for peace to be ruptured and then reframed on new terms. Conversion slotted into a set of avenues for negotiation between the duke and the inhabitants of cities like Stettin and Julin.

Otto's disruption provided the opportunity for a renewed affirmation of political relationships, similar perhaps to the confrontations that Richard Barton and Stephen White suggest were occasions for the revisitation of agreements between lay aristocrats in eleventh- and twelfth-century France.[136] When Otto's party arrived in Stettin the inhabitants refused to cooperate for two months until the evangelist contacted Boleslav for advice. At this point, rather than block Otto's messengers, the townspeople sent their own representatives to press for an enduring peace (*stabilitatem perpetuae pacis*) and lower tribute.[137] Boleslav sent a letter of rebuke, guaranteeing "firm peace" and "extended friendships" (*pacem firmam et longas amicitias*) only to those Pomeranians "who served the sacraments of faith." He then offered them

133. Once again, churchmen were following Gregory the Great's advice to meet weakness on its own terms. Gregory, *Reg. past.* 2.5, 32B-C.

134. Ebbo, Vita Ottonis 2.1, 842: "'Animales,' inquit, 'sunt et spiritualium penitus ignari donorum, ideoque hominem non nisi exteriori habitu metiuntur. Me quidem pro paupertatis mene tenuitate abiecerunt; sed si potens quisquam praedicator, cuius gloriam et divicias reverentur, et ad eos accesserit, spero illos iugum Christi spontanee subituros.'"

135. When attacked by the inhabitants of Julin (Herbord, *Vita Ottonis* 2.23, 789), the monks chopped down a bridge to delay their pursuers.

136. Stephen D. White, "The Politics of Anger," in *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages*, ed. Barbara Rosenwein (Ithaca, NY, 1998), 127–152; and Richard E. Barton, "Zealous Anger and the Renegotiation of Aristocratic Relationships in Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century France," in Rosenwein, *Anger's Past*, 153–170.

137. Herbord, *Vita Ottonis* 2.25, 790.

"reduced servitude and tribute" (*servitutis ac tributi pondus . . . decrevi*) as well as peace in exchange for their conversion under Bishop Otto.[138] Herbord gives Otto credit for conversion in Stettin, but this is to ignore how both Boleslav and the townspeople had manipulated the missionaries. It is not clear that the Stettinites were actually *paying* the tribute before this; they used the missionaries to mediate a new settlement, whether this was Otto's intention or not. Nevertheless, while offering peace on adjusted terms, Boleslav portrayed the bishop and his entourage as the citizens' advocates, a shield against the duke's anger.[139] As the bishop's biographers would style it, through a counterpoint between Boleslav's sword and Otto's ministry, "arms were being turned to peace" in Pomerania.[140]

In its association of peacemaking and conversion, Otto's mission in Pomerania resembles episodes in the (likely) eleventh-century *Miracles of Saint Ursmar of Lobbes*, in which monks carried the saint's relics into violent Flemish towns. According to Geoffrey Koziol, the Lobbesians "made peace" by isolating and humiliating recalcitrant locals—actions that resemble monastic discipline.[141] However, as I have argued in chapter 1, the discipline the Lobbesians conveyed was a turbulent emotional transformation, grief and regret that preceded religious conversion. On occasion, Otto would provoke a similar outpouring of remorse, typically through an aggressive or transgressive act. Without asking permission from the head of the household, he baptized the sons and wife of a prominent Stettinite named Domizlav, whose family appears to have controlled the town in defiance of the authority of Duke Wortizlav of Pomerania. Like many of the dignitaries that the missionaries converted, Domizlav had once been baptized but had allowed his faith to dissipate in the company of pagans. His authority as householder challenged, he now confronted Otto, who immediately fell to his knees and prayed for grace to descend where it was needed. Filled with fear and love of God, Domizlav then underwent a Damascene conversion, turning "from wolf to lamb," kneeling and prostrating himself before Otto. He brought his household to the font, along with various other *socii*, a total of five hundred

138. Herbord, *Vita Ottonis* 2.29, 792.

139. Herbord, *Vita Ottonis* 2.29, 792.

140. Ebbo, *Vita Ottonis* 2.18, 856–857.

141. Geoffrey Koziol, "Monks, Feuds, and the Making of Peace," in *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000*, ed. Thomas Head and Richard Landes (Ithaca, NY, 1992), 239–259.

souls according to the chronicler Ebbo (whose enthusiasm may be inflating the numbers). By forcing a confrontation, the missionary had occasioned the transfer of grace, the choreography of reconciliation thus incorporating the spiritual transformation of the antagonist.[142]

Such a dramatic and affecting conversion was no less a political act than other renegotiations of aristocratic relationships, since Domizlav controlled the sentiments of Stettin, and where Stettin went, smaller towns followed.[143] Conversion accessed the fidelity of Domizlav's entourage, who converted too, creating a valuable ally for Otto.[144] Most likely this also forged an alliance between Domizlav and Otto's ducal sponsor, the acquisitive Boleslav of Polonia. Boleslav was at that moment negotiating new conditions of servitude and tribute with the Stettinites, thus completely taking the region out of Wortizlav's control.

The differences between the Lobbesian and Pomeranian accounts show how by the second half of the twelfth century, conversion and peacemaking had become interchangeable in both theology and practice. Whereas in the Ursmar story, a sudden spiritual conversion gives truth to peace and obviates the need for compromise, in Herbord's and Ebbo's narratives, conversion self-consciously patterns itself on an ongoing negotiation (or "processing") of conflict. In fact, there can be no conversion without the initial conflict, and often the evangelist bishop himself provokes such a quarrel. Otto was eager for martyrdom and would welcome clamoring mobs and even anger the Slavs by destroying their property.[145] His entourage and sponsors would then have to intervene, calling city elders to a meeting where conversion became the central issue.[146] Both sides would adopt delaying tactics. In one instance, the citizens of Julin deferred making a decision on mass conversion to the larger city of Stettin, saying that they would convert only if their fellow citizens did so first.[147] When the citizens were slow to receive the bishop he made them wait even longer, and then blamed them.

---

142. Ebbo, *Vita Ottonis* 2.9, 849.

143. See below on Julin; Herbord, *Vita Ottonis* 2.24, 789.

144. Ebbo, *Vita Ottonis* 2.9, 849, notes that after his conversion Domizlav helped the spread of the faith even more than he had previously hindered it.

145. Herbord, *Vita Ottonis* 2.23, 788, describes Otto "hoping to receive martyrdom's crown to the fullest (*ad coronam passionis se invitari sperans*)" standing his ground "with joyful spirit and delighted countenance" in order to merit wounds in Christ's name, while others trembled and wept.

146. An assault on the missionaries and their subsequent negotiations with the people of Julin is described in Herbord, *Vita Ottonis* 2.23–24, 788–789.

147. Herbord, *Vita Ottonis* 2.24, 789.

In its choreography, the evangelical process resembles the pugilistic methods of conflict negotiation that historians have described for early medieval western Europe. The missionaries provoked a confrontation in order to renegotiate relationships for the duke and for their God, and the Slavs responded as if all were playing the same game. Playing on the phrase *pacti sacramenta* (oaths/sacraments of peace), Herbord says the Pomeranians recited their oaths to Otto with more alacrity than they had oaths of submission after their military defeat at Nacla.[148] When conversion was successful, former pagans were invited to form a new war alliance and to join clerics in destroying temples and idols, using axes, hatchets, and fire.[149]

This readiness (on the part of missionary and biographer) to present evangelism as a pugnacious negotiation says much about the imagined relationship between war, peace, and conversion. Conversion stood in for a cessation of hostilities and redefined political relationships because it crowned an acquisitive lord's subjugation of frontier territory; in fact, it framed the terms of subjugation. Like spiritual friendship, political alliance, *amicitia*, and *pacta* accessed the will, faith, and capacity for true love between participants. These bonds of peace were therefore interchangeable, and by implication, the convergence of conversion and armed conflict did not imply coercion, only the employment of the temporal (passions, wealth, and weapons) toward spiritual benefit.[150] Physical combat between Christian and pagan mimed moral conflict in advance of its occurrence. Thus Slavic political resistance became spiritual recalcitrance; Christian defeat read as martyrdom; and pagans who switched sides received the cross as arms with which to turn on their former allies.[151]

This evangelical embrace of secular mechanisms created complications for the missionary, embroiling him in the ebb and flow of politics on the frontiers of Christian territory. To the Pomeranians, Otto seems to have advertised peacemaking as the goal of conversion, and so, when in the wake of his ministry, Boleslav attacked the region yet again, community leaders at

148. Herbord, *Dialogus* 2.30, 120. Herbord, *Vita Ottonis* (MGH edition) 2.29, 793, has Nada in place of Nacla, most likely an error of transcription.

149. Herbord, *Vita Ottonis* 2.29, 793. Declaring that God refuses an alliance with other deities, Otto invited the Pomeranians to join his so that they may cast off their fears of demons and help him destroy the temples of the old gods.

150. I thank Philippe Buc for his suggestion of a similarity between Otto's methods and those of Gregory the Great toward the Jews of Sicily: even if the Jews' conversions had been bought with tax exemptions, at least their children would be true believers.

151. Herbord, *Vita Ottonis* 2.29, 793.

once protested to the missionary bishop: "Lord father, by the word of God, you had promised us liberty and soundest peace when we submitted to the yoke of the Christian faith."[152] The Pomeranians insisted on immunity from assault, arguing that now cleansed by baptism, they should not be soiled by the spilling of human blood. Otto responded in like terms, reiterating his promise that the God he had brought them would remove the cause of war and bring about peace, even if he, Otto, had to die in the process of achieving it.[153]

Evolving notions of peace helped facilitate and justify worldly intrusions in the Christian encampment. The inner man could be accessed and renewed only by means of the outer; carnal stimuli must serve as signifiers of spiritual eminence. By extension, all secular disciplinary measures, including the use of force, were permissible for the missionary enterprise. In Pomerania, an ambitious duke had played the part of Geoffrey Babion's David, "the strong-armed one" while in his wake, Bishop Otto of Bamberg had acted as an evangelizing Solomon, driving away pagan deities as he conveyed the word and grace to infidels.[154] We must now ask if these same motifs were manifested in discussions of peacemaking at home as new and reformed communities explored their place in the economy of salvation.

The Cistercians and Their Peace

A safeguard for evangelical missions and missionaries, peace also protected religious communities by binding them in a mutual and continuous spiritual relationship with exemplary leaders who were not physically present. For instance, ducal reprisals and peace treaties with local populations ensured that Bishop Otto always found himself a few blows short of martyrdom, but since his seat in Bamberg remained unattended, the missionary had concerns beyond his own safety. The peace that connected a flock with their physically absent leader was an approximation of the *pax* that associated Christ with his church. In the manner of Christ, Otto left peace to the members

152. Ebbo, *Vita Ottonis* 3.13, 868: "Tu domine pater, nobis christianae fidei iugum subeuntibus libertatem firmissimamque pacem in verbo Dei promisisti."

153. Ebbo, *Vita Ottonis* 3.13, 868. Herbord, *Vita Ottonis* 3.10, 807–808, also describes Otto's mediation between the Polonians and the Pomeranians.

154. Herbord, *Vita Ottonis* 2.2, 766, describes Boleslav's use of a *manus robusta* in the recovery of territories that he claimed as his.

of his church before his first mission.[155] Citing Matthew chapter 5, "Blessed are the peacemakers," Otto insisted that his flock understand how valuable peace was and how assiduously they must cultivate it. Peace connected them to him, even as he went abroad to face dangers, just as it had connected Christ to the apostles even beyond death. United by this, they could follow his exemplary humility and cultivate hospitality and other "things that are good, not only in the sight of God but in the sight of men," at home and abroad.[156]

These injunctions to peace indicate how a spiritual leader could maintain community despite his or her physical absence through intersubjective emotional access. Peace allowed the pastoral enterprise to reflect back to Otto's home church, and his merit to accrue to the altar of Bamberg. Through peace, the missionary became an exemplar not only to foreign communities but also to those in Swabia and Bavaria, in this manner connecting far-flung portions of pagan and Christian Europe.

The expansion and institutional coherence of the Cistercian order also testifies to the importance of this connective peace for maintaining community. Despite their stated desire to retreat from the world of laymen, monastic orders pursued several evangelical and expansionary projects in the first half of the twelfth century. Based on their reputation as worldly taskmasters and power brokers of the previous century, the Cluniacs appear as an obvious example. However, while Cluniacs featured prominently in the entourage of Pope Eugenius III, when he declared the Second Crusade, it was the Cistercians who most effectively wedded flight to the wilderness with immersion in politics. Eugenius, formerly Bernard of Pisa, was himself a Cistercian. His mentor—and severest critic—Saint Bernard of Clairvaux epitomizes the idiosyncratic approach of early Cistercian leaders to the amelioration and expansion of the *Corpus Christianorum*.

The Christian knight (*miles*) finds his most exquisite definition in the writings of Saint Bernard. In the wake of the Zenghid resurgence in the Holy Land, Bernard wrote energetically and often to all Christian princes, urging a Second Crusade to defend and restore the Frankish kingdoms of

155. Ebbo, *Vita Ottonis* 2.3, 845: "pacem relinquo vobis, pacem iterum atque iterum inculcans commendo vobis" (I leave peace to you, again and again impressing peace, I commend you.) Cf. John 14.27.

156. Ebbo, *Vita Ottonis* 2.3, 845.

the East.[157] At the same time, the abbot of Clairvaux called for the secular powers to expand Christendom among the Wendish Slavs, and to protect the papacy against threats from the Roman commune. In the first half of the twelfth century, as Cistercian networks were formalizing, they relied heavily on the personality of Bernard. He also determined the direction of Cistercian sponsorship, especially to military orders that had emerged in Europe and the Holy Land at the time of the Second Crusade. Installation charters of the Order of Calatrava show that the Cistercians continued this sponsorship after Bernard's death. First Fitero and then its mother house, Morimond, were charged with the spiritual training of the knights of Calatrava.[158] The Cistercians also mediated disputes between the military orders and shaped their institutional growth. After they lost their citadel in 1195, the knights of Calatrava secured additional land grants from the Cistercians by convincing traditional monasteries in the region to transfer to the Cistercian Rule.[159]

The counterpoint of political engagement and secular flight intensified during the twelfth century. Cistercian abbots Aelred of Rievaulx, Isaac of Stella, and Joachim of Fiore gained a fearsome reputation as hermits, and then, in the vein of hermits, spent much of their time advising and guiding errant princes, such as Stephen of Blois and Henry II, and crusaders like Richard the Lionhearted. Refined understandings of true peace allowed these monks to simultaneously participate in a celestial community and in the intersection of multiple sociopolitical complexes. By defining themselves as peacemakers and keepers of the peace, the Cistercians remained involved in the world and its transformation without succumbing to *curiositas*, the sin that resulted when solicitous interest gave way to carnal obsession.

---

157. By the 1140s, previously disunited Muslim groups in Syria had begun to come together around the then relatively unfamiliar ideology of *jihad* (in this case, the "lesser" or external struggle as opposed to an internal, spiritual one). Historians see the fall of Edessa in 1144 as a key moment in this galvanization of Islamic energies; it gave the Muslims a leader in the Turkish warrior Zengi, the first of a series of charismatic generals that would culminate in the Kurd Saladin. Carole Hillenbrand, *The Crusades: Islamic Perspectives* (New York, 2000), 110–116, describes the rise and eventual fall of Zengi, arguing that he provided a focal point for cultural and political aspirations to *jihad* that had gradually emerged in the wake of the Frankish conquest of Jerusalem..

158. Fitero provided the first knights. The abbot of the Carthusian Scala Dei and his monks were responsible for the "paternal oversight" of the Order of Calatrava. In 1186, the Calatravans were assigned "the counsel" of the abbot of Morimond, without any mention of paternal supervision. Joseph O' Callaghan, "The Affiliation of the Order of Calatrava with the Order of Cîteaux," *The Spanish Military Order of Calatrava and Its Affiliates* (London, 1975), 48–50; Vicente Lampérez y Romea, "El real monasterio de Fitero en Navarra," *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia* 46 (1905): 288–290.

159. See O'Callaghan, "Affiliation," 39.

Perhaps as a safeguard against *curiositas*, the order as a whole became an engine of peace primarily designed to protect the emotional state of its members. In recent years there has been considerable debate as to the early shape of the Cistercian community and the inception of its regulations. Constance Berman has argued that until Bernard's death, to be Cistercian meant to participate in a certain mode of living, governed by a reconfigured liturgy but ultimately adherent to a traditional Benedictine Rule. The famous complex of mother and daughter houses regulated by an abbatial council formed later, as a result of pressure from southern French houses that feared relegation in the wake of domination by the order's Burgundian founders.[160] However, even if its statutes emerged only in the second half of the twelfth century, the Cistercians emphasized unity and coordination from the outset, albeit through less formalized means. As Martha Newman has pointed out, the Cistercians saw mutual charity as the force that bound them in amity and obedience.[161] And to charity, we must add the elevation of peace, a hallmark of the Cistercians reflected in their earliest charters.

Peace and charity turned the Cistercian reformed living into a tightly knit, highly organized order in the vanguard of what Robert Bartlett calls the "internal and external expansion" of Frankish Christendom.[162] The reform monks relied on peace to create coherent lines of communication and obedience in an order that combined introspection and self-reliance with physical dispersal to the boundaries of Christendom. The Cistercian Charter of Charity may be the movement's first constitutive text, and from its earliest iterations it calls on members to bond in "a mutual peace." The brothers of the order had espoused peace so that, "although dispersed in body through various parts of the world, they would be linked indissolubly as souls."[163] Peace and charity provided unity for a community that represented its growth as "apostolic gestation" (Berman's term), a future leader and twelve followers

160. See Constance Berman, *The Cistercian Evolution: The Invention of a Religious Order in Twelfth-Century Europe* (Philadelphia, 2000).

161. See Martha Newman, *The Boundaries of Charity: Cistercian Culture and Ecclesiastical Reform, 1098–1180* (Stanford, CA, 1996) on the role of love in ensuring the coherence of the Cistercian order.

162. Robert Bartlett, *The Making of Europe: Conquest, Colonization, and Cultural Change, 950–1350* (Princeton, NJ, 1993).

163. Prologue to *Carta caritatis prior*, in *Narrative and Legislative Texts from Early Cîteaux*, ed. and trans. Chrysogonus Waddell (Nuits-Saint-Georges, 1999), 274: "in diversis mundi partibus corporibus divisi, animis indissolubiliter conglutinarentur."

departing one Cistercian house in order to found another in the wilderness; the new abbey would grow as a daughter of the old, and its leader would attend the annual general council of abbots.

A commitment to mutual peace allowed the Cistercians to govern themselves, even far from the mother houses, and it was enshrined in the order's foundation text, the *Little Exord.*[164] Robert of Molesme had led twelve of his monks into the wilderness of Cîteaux and then returned to his former abbey under duress. In the absence of their inspirational founder, Stephen Harding rallied the Cistercians and established the distinctive grange system to sustain their way of life. Several decades later, Cîteaux began budding: four sister houses and eventually hundreds of daughters. More often than not, the Cistercians expanded through incorporation and conversion of existing monasteries. However, this did not detract from a self-image in which the obedience of daughter institutions emerged from the love between the various houses.[165] The ideal of peace had a practical component. Along with the initial Charter of Charity and a growing set of Institutes, a general abbatial chapter was mandated to police the hundreds of houses and members that by 1160 had spread from Galicia to Poland and the Holy Land. The general chapter embodied the commitment to peace laid out in the Cistercian Charter of Charity, creating a module of universal Christendom within a bounded community of the vow.

Despite—or perhaps because of—its professed shyness of the world, the Cistercian movement demonstrates the clearest intersection between the conception and practice of peace. Its leaders applied seemingly abstract understandings of peace and charity to the enhancement of community within the order; thus equipped, they proceeded to make peace between princes of the church and world. Paul Dalton argues for a close relationship between Cistercian notions of peace through charity and their actual role in councils of mediation between English barons.[166] According to Marsha Dutton, Aelred of Rievaulx, who wrote a mirror of princes for Henry II, also worked to limit the worst effects of the anarchy of King Stephen and served at the

164. *Exordium Parvum*, in Waddell, *Narrative and Legislative Texts*, 417–439.

165. Berman, *Cistercian Evolution*, 103–104, debunks the image of Cistercian budding, suggesting that while it may have taken place in a few cases, for the most part the early Cistercian foundations were incorporations of extant houses. Cistercian "apostolic gestation" or budding covers a later, quasi-colonial expansion. Berman argues (107) that the *Exord* that describes this budding may date from as late as 1175 despite its claim of a papal confirmation in 1119.

166. Paul Dalton, "Churchmen and the Promotion of Peace in King Stephen's Reign," *Viator* 31 (2000): 79–119, esp. 87, 90–91, 97–99.

Scottish court of David I. He and Isaac of Stella were among several English Cistercians who successfully transferred conceptions of Christian imperial peace—concord between *regnum* and *sacerdotium*—from the German kings to the English monarchy. They also stood witness to the breakdown of this concord during the Becket Controversy.[167]

Aelred wrote approvingly of the role of churchmen in politics, using the tenth-century Saint Dunstan as a model. Dunstan had served several Anglo-Saxon rulers: he forbore with wicked kings like Edwig, since they ruled by God's will, and played witness and adviser to great peacemaking monarchs, like Edgar. Aelred describes Dunstan's visions of peace at Edgar's birth, when the "night of infidelity" was driven off, and kingdom and nature alike submitted to the monarch without resistance. Under Dunstan's tutelage, Edgar confected a "heavenly peace" in the kingdom, confederating persons of many differing tongues under a single law. And for this the English king was called "Solomon," since Solomon means "peacemaker."[168] Aelred similarly urged Henry II to bring peace to England, through cooperation with the church. Known for his political acumen and energies, Abbot Aelred walked a fine line between charity and *curiositas* and likely secured for Rievaulx episcopal immunities and confirmation of assets that other Cistercian houses were unable to acquire. There is some suggestion that his machinations for his own abbey drew the ire of sister houses, such as Fountains.[169] Aelred's meditations on peace thus speak to very present problems of community and harmony, between monks and laity and also within the profession itself.

In his *Mirror of Charity*, Aelred described the familial relationship between peace, charity, and unity. Charity binds contrary elements in a harmonious peace. It is the key to the ordained universal order; disharmonious elements do not disturb the peace of the universal order but only emphasize it by contrast.[170] A charitable community conjoined its members in the Lord's yoke, an authentic tranquility.[171] Although much of Aelred's text speaks to the

167. See Marsha L. Dutton, "*Sancto Dunstano Cooperante*: Collaboration between King and Ecclesiastical Advisor in Aelred of Rievaulx's Genealogy of the Kings of the English," in *Religious and Laity in Western Europe, 1000–1400: Interaction, Negotiation, and Power*, ed. Emilia Jamroziak and Janet Burton (Turhnout, 2006), 193–194.

168. Dutton, "Collaboration," 191.

169. Emilia Jamroziak, *Rievaulx Abbey and Its Social Context, 1132–1300: Memory, Locality, and Networks* (Turnhout, 2005), 175.

170. Aelred, *De spec. car.* 1.21.59, 37.

171. Aelred, *De spec. car.* 1.31.88, 51.

cultivation of peace and charity within persons, he argues against a limitation of these virtues to the individual self. Inner peacemaking is simply the initial step, albeit an essential one.[172] Aelred concentrates on social peace, enumerating a series of social affections in order of ease: love of self and family come first, while love of enemies is hardest to achieve. Tellingly, for a text directed at fellow monks, Aelred assumes that love of kin and clients is easier than love of those who share the same profession.

Aelred's moral speculations went to the heart of medieval community formation and disruption, giving substance to one of Gregory the Great's more oracular pronouncements in the *Pastoral Care*: peacemakers should be ready to destroy peace, if necessary. For Aelred, disruption became necessary when the sequence of Sabbaths was reversed, when charity turned into love of self, and seeming peace became a form of violence. To a self-centered mind, its own laziness appeared to be the gentle yoke of the Lord: it felt no need to unite in a greater charity.[173] Tellingly, in minds such as these, even the slightest disruption would awaken a beast, and gnawing passions would allow no peace for the soul; a false peace would expose itself in extreme eruption.

Social relationships mattered because they forced the human being to regard more than himself or herself, even if that initial regard were adversarial. Like several thinkers who framed their church as an engine of peace, Aelred insisted on a system of constant rebuke, to waken the sleeping, console the struggling, and reward those who had ascended.[174] Since all things have their own tranquility, their own bond of unity conjoined by some version of peace, to transfer a person from one such bond to another (more beneficial) pattern, there must be disturbance.[175] The goal of earthly community was to bolster human patience and faith through the redirection of love, however painful.

The nature of this love determined whether a group conformed to ideal community. Since members came together through free choice, the society they chose exposed their relationship to divine will. It did not matter that the community enjoyed internal harmony if that harmony were not somehow directed by love of God and each other. Tranquil communities were not truly at peace if the members looked only to one another for sustenance. In fact,

---

172. Aelred, *De spec. car.* 3.2, 107. And see chapter 5 above.

173. Aelred, *De spec. car.* 2.3.6, 68. Aelred says even the sting of compunction would have no effect because with their desires reversed, the lax would misread it. *De spec. car.* 2.7.17–19, 74–75.

174. Aelred, *De spec. car.* 2.8.20–21, 75.

175. Aelred, *De spec. car.* 1.21.60–61, 38.

they constituted a disfigurement of a Godly society. If the members were to be saved, they must first be deprived of the facile and illusory peace that kept the group tranquil. The same ruptures that saved the individual from hasty contentment also maintained authentic communities in a bond of peace.

During the twelfth century, a socially engaged clergy made peace the cornerstone of their expanding church. A churchman carried with him the peace of the church, as a townsman did the peace of his city, but unlike the townsman, who could enjoy his peace but not convey it, the churchman could do both. Twelfth-century churchmen understood their peace as both a sacramental and an exorcising process, a conveyance of grace that remolded senses and desires to rupture debilitating bonds and generate a community of the willing. In various books of scripture, they saw this peace modeled. In their cathedral schools and monasteries, they saw rectors as the *exempla* both for peace and for its distortion. And when subjective transformations of taste and delight accompanied the taking up of the Eucharist, they felt they had glimpsed real peace. By the end of the twelfth century, churchmen had successfully reinvented their profession as a great engine of peace, but one that embraced aggression, insurrection, and militancy.

The dissemination and maintenance of peace became the modus operandi and hallmark of the churchman's existence. Furthermore, careful definitions of peacemaking allowed servants of the church to also be servants of the world but without being enslaved to its carnality or its violence. But the peace that churchmen offered did not simply pacify the world: it set it into consternation, so that the last became first in humanity's spectrum of tastes and concerns. Thus the Gregorian reform mandate of insurrectionist peacemaking, potentially nihilistic, became the kernel of an expansionist and universalizing church. Turbulent peacemaking became the standard for the redirection of love, the establishment of emotional discipline, and the formation of appropriate bonds of charity and community. But while these notions of peace gave churchmen a reinvigorated sense of themselves, questions remained as to what peace meant in terms of the larger community of Christians: the spiritual disciplining of laypersons. Who was worthy of making peace, and who of receiving it? In the next two chapters, we examine appropriate, aberrant, and governable communitarian modes, as seen through the clerical rubric of authentic and inverted peace.Exporting Peace

Chapter 7

Communes

Inversions of Peace

In 1112 the inhabitants of Laon rose up against their rulers, massacred their bishop, Gaudry, and indulged in carnivalesque acts of vandalism and homicide before an opportunistic warlord, Thomas de Marle, subjugated the city. When Guibert, abbot of Nogent-sous-Coucy, searched for lessons from the urban insurrection and its bloody consequences, he pointed to a fatal peace that Gaudry had made and then broken with the populace: an association that "took the new and most terrible (*pessimum*) name of commune."[1] For the scriptural exegete and theologian Guibert, the commune's recourse to bloodshed was only the epiphenomenon of deeper, structural violence: loss of peace in the church.

As churchmen came to terms with communes during the twelfth century, they initially treated them as useful scandals: a negative sign or text. Of course, any town could be treated this way. According to Herman of Tournai, Bruges erupted into apocalyptic chaos following the murder of Count Charles the Good, the civic strife only emphasizing the power of a prince who had kept these "turbulent people" (the Flemings) as quiet as monks; barometers for injustice, the townspeople then put their chaotic anger at the

1. Guibert of Nogent, *Monodies* 3.7, in *Autobiographie*, ed. Edmond-René Labande (Paris, 1981), 322 (henceforth *Monodies*).

service of Baldwin of Ghent, who avenged Charles.[2] Thus as mute foils for right authority, townspeople were always useful; but communards actually spoke, and what they had to say sounded eerily familiar. Oaths (sacraments) of mutual protection and internally policed regulations and responsibilities made communes appear to be conspiracies or even, as I argue here, an inversion of truly peaceful community.

Communal charters and accounts of uprising suggest that communards used the vocabulary of peacemaking to justify their demands; to clerical observers this made them recognizable as a threat to authentic peace, and a subterfuge of divinely sanctioned political order. At the same time, this dangerous shared semantic space allowed communes to incorporate themselves in collective images of redemption and salvation, images that elided the inescapable fact that urban oath collectives had assumed the administration of high medieval cities, and were proving politically indispensable to traditional authorities. Although they gained political traction in very different circumstances, in France as well as in northern Italy, communes were seen as either a necessary scandal or an instrument of liberation from the captivity of worldly and abusive bishops. In the course of the twelfth century, both detractors and supporters would emphasize how, regardless of its abhorrent nature, the formation of a commune accused a city's clerical rulers of hidden violence and loss of peace. As the Roman commune of 1150 demonstrated, the urban oath community would even deny the pope administrative powers if he appeared to betray appropriate peace.

The reemergence of city life in medieval Europe coincided with transformations in modes of production, new expressions of Christian identity, the expansion of options for affiliation and loyalty, and redirected anxieties regarding the moral welfare of laypersons who lived in close contact but were alienated from their traditional social collectives.[3] Emblematic of these changes, and the initial suspicions they aroused, the commune was predicated on the mutual protection of sworn members. By the end of the eleventh century, communes had demanded the right to police and protect entire cities. Even today the word "commune" conveys the cognitive dissonance with which it was first received: liberty and insurrection in a single package.

---

2. Herman of Tournai, *Liber de restauratione monasterii sancti Martini Tornacensis* 30, ed. G. Waitz et al., MGH SS 14:286.

3. On the moral conflicts that accompanied city life, see the enduring model proposed by Lester Little, *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy in Medieval Europe* (Ithaca, NY, 1978); on choices, see Caroline Walker Bynum, "Did the Twelfth Century Discover the Individual?" *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages* (Berkeley, 1982), 82–108.

The Paris Commune of 1871 espoused these elements in equal measure, and popular protest today always carries the potential for revolt to become revolution, a movement larger than its immediate concerns, whose implications shake not only the people involved but observers as well.

Today a communal uprising may be habilitated as a signifier of democracy denied, its violence thus absorbed and legitimized in the political process, even as it constitutes a rupture. Twelfth-century observers looked elsewhere to make sense of the commune's turbulence. While at first glance the commune appeared to be the complete inversion of divinely constituted authority on earth, that very inversion would implicate it within an expanding and self-correcting ecclesial body. Via their portrayals of the commune, twelfth-century churchmen constructed the city as a site for negotiation between spirit and flesh, a space in which the internal conflicts of the redeemed self could find external elaboration.

The Commune as Conspiracy?

Although not all communes were born of war, they evolved in towns alongside internal strife or outside threat, and critics presented their essential nature as bellicose despite the irenic language of their charters. Towns like Valenciennes and Laon called their agreement a *pax* or *institutio pacis*; communal oaths echoed language from the Peace of God movement (peace that pleased God, directed toward the good, with enmity toward the wicked), and corporate seals bore motifs depicting peace personified.[4] Nevertheless, critics pointed out that the communal oath primarily ensured the townspeople would band together against attack, and therefore secured only "peace against everyone else."[5] The initial provision of the 1114 charter of the Pax of Valenciennes states: "There is sanctity and stability" in peace; but then it goes on to specify that this stability refers to protection for merchants who have business with the city, with the exception of those from Douai.[6] Not unlike the Gregorian

4. For Valenciennes, see *La paix de Valenciennes de 1114: Commentaire et édition critique,* ed. P. Godding and J. Pycke (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1981), 100–137; see also Dolorosa Kennelly, "Medieval Towns and the Peace of God," *Medievalia et humanistica* 15 (1962): 42–52; and Hagen Keller, "Die Entstehung der italienishcen Stadtkommunen," *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 10 (1976): 195.

5. Otto Gerhard Oexle, "Peace through Conspiracy," in *Ordering Medieval Society: Perspectives on Intellectual and Practical Modes of Shaping Social Relations*, ed. Bernhard Jussen, trans. Pamela Selwyn (Philadelphia, 2001), 285–322, expounds on these suspicions of the commune among eleventh- and twelfth-century churchmen. On a similar criticism of limited peace leveled against the Burgundian Capuciati of 1182–1183, see below.

6. *Paix de Valenciennes* 1, 103.

reformers, who had sanctified the rebellion of the Pataria in Milan, communards were also ready to fight for their notion of peace: in 1128, the citizens of Lille attacked Count William when he violated the terms of peace (in this case protection of serfs), and the upheaval of the Capuciati of Auxerre in 1180 began as a demand for peace from the local bishop.[7] The charter of the Laon commune legislates against members insulting one another or prosecuting each other out of hatred (*odium*), but the organization emerged in such bloody circumstances that any invocations of peace may have only underlined a clerical view of the commune as inversion of right order.[8]

In other words, a commune could legitimately be treated as a war alliance conceived as peace, not unlike those that episcopal and lay rulers had used against one another in previous generations.[9] Even the Truce of God (despite its legislation of sacred times without fighting) ultimately served to organize, discipline, and then deploy a united band of knights: witness Count Baldwin V of Flanders in the 1040s before his war with Henry III, Archbishop Aimon of Bourges's armed "Peace League" of the 1030s and 1040s, and Pope Urban II in 1095 on the occasion of the First Crusade.[10] In 1069, Bishop Odo of Toul refuted Count Arnulf's claims over the city, assembled an oath community to limit the duties of a new count, and justified this overthrow as a return to justice, so that God might be recognized as "true peace" (*pax vera*).[11] It is not surprising then that the commune would seem to appropriate extant norms of peace for the purpose of resistance against others; after all, it had eminent exemplars. The key difference was that members of a commune

7. See Jeff Rider, *God's Scribe: The Historiographical Art of Galbert of Bruges* (Washington, DC, 2001), 142–43. I have described the revolt of the Capuciati at length in a subsequent section of this chapter.

8. *Charte communale de Laon*, in *Documents sur les relations de la royauté avec les villes en France de 1180 à 1314*, ed. A. Giry (Geneva, 1974; orig. Paris, 1885), esp. provisions 10, 14, and 24:16–19. See Guibert's representation of the Laon commune below.

9. For a discussion of communal armies, their insignia, discipline, and social cohesion, see J. F. Verbruggen, *The Art of Warfare in Western Europe during the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge, UK, 1997 and 2002; Flemish orig., Brussels, 1954), 173–177.

10. See Thomas Head, "The Judgment of God: Andrew of Fleury's Account of the Peace League of Bourges," *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000*, ed. Thomas Head and Richard Landes (Ithaca, NY, 1992), 219–238. See Hartmut Hoffmann, *Gottesfriede und Treuga Dei*, MGH Schriften 20 (Stuttgart, 1964), 105–108, on Bourges, and more generally on the Truce as an instrument of military association, 104–129. See also Albert Vermeesch, *Essai sur les origines et la signification de la commune dans le nord de la France (xie et xiie siècles)* (Heule, 1966), 23–48, on the diocesan association and its relationship to the Bourges commune of 1108.

11. *Urkunden zu deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte im 10. 11. und 12. Jahrhundert* 8, ed. Georg Waitz (Berlin, 1886), 15.

were bound by a seditious, temporal oath, while ecclesiastical peace assemblies claimed the protection of true sacraments.

Despite or perhaps because of similarities to clerical peace associations, and the invocation of terms such as charity, friendship, and brotherhood, the peace of communes read as violence in disguise. As Otto Gerhard Oexle has expressed it, this sworn association of townspeople for mutual protection and obedience constituted "peacemaking by means of conspiracy."[12] Oexle explains clerical suspicions of communal peace through the contrast between the limited peace of the protection pact and the universalism of the church's peace. The communes "conflicted with other varieties of group formation," which were founded on the natural bonds of kinship and customary ties to lordship.[13]

However, this discrepancy might have been seen simply as inadequacy, and not perversion, had it not been for a prevailing fear of shadow sacraments and false community in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. In its appropriation of recognizable forms of social ordering the commune mimicked political authority that God had instituted on earth. When lay rulers acquiesced to communal demands for charters, clerical observers reacted with horror, seeing in this a double betrayal: not only was the commune making a mockery of divine will by governing through the will of members, but the ruler, who should jealously preserve the authority bestowed on him, was surrendering a religious mandate for political ends. In the eleventh century, a similar reaction had greeted other forms of urban assembly that provided a basis for collective bargaining with the prince. Alpert of Metz expressed disgust at a confraternity of the litigious merchants of Tiel, who "accosted the king frequently," in order to claim autonomy.[14] Members were only responsible to one another and could clear themselves of accusations simply by swearing oaths. The confraternity members inverted discipline by following their own wills rather than the king's law, but most humiliatingly, they could show that they had an imperial charter to do so.[15]

---

12. See Oexle, "Peace through Conspiracy," 306–307, for numerous assertions among churchmen about communes that pretended peace while employing violence. While indebted to Oexle for the framing of questions relating bonds of peace to conspiratorial bonds, I will explain the nature of this reversal differently.

13. Oexle, "Peace through Conspiracy," 307.

14. Alpert of Metz, *De diversitate temporum libri duo*, ed. Hans van Rij and Anna Sapir Abulafia (Amsterdam, 1980), 78–80.

15. Alpert said they were a hard people, lacking in discipline, who made judgments, "not according to the law but according to [their] will, and they are saying this is given and confirmed to them by a charter from the emperor." Alpert, *De diversitate*, 80: "iudicia non secundum legem sed secundum voluntatem decernentes, et hoc ab imperatore karta traditum et firmatum dicunt."

Similar to an internally governing merchant fraternity, a communal assembly became the occasion for the prince to demonstrate either his prowess or his inadequacies. In 1115, Ivo of Chartres contrasted the false peace of the commune with the king's peace in order to rebuke Louis the Fat of France. From extant charters, later ratified and expanded by his grandson Phillip Augustus, it is apparent that Louis had begun to expand the monarchy's rule beyond the Île de France through a policy of communal grants that fell afoul of his churchmen.[16] According to Ivo, the king had a canonical duty to aid Bishop Gaudry of Amiens, whose city had been afflicted by a commune.[17] He warned Louis not to allow the kingdom's divinely instituted peace to be violated because of his slothfulness or ill-considered friendship. As Philippe Buc has shown, political oaths easily became false *amicitia*, since rulers designed them for individual situations and to be abrogated in the future.[18] To convey *amicitia* by means of a royal oath to an avowedly seditious body seemed abhorrent. In effect, two misguided forms of peace—torpor and *amicitia*—exposed the king's carnality, while, by contrast, the universal and blessed peace of the entire kingdom elevated him as God's political instrument.

The diabolical implications of the communal oath laid members open to the charge of inverted community. It should be clear from the previous chapters that among the multifarious concerns regarding the integrity of sacraments, a sacrament's role as a pact assumed great significance. Judas's betrayal of Jesus violated both the sacrament of the Last Supper and the disciple's loyalty to his master; it became the paradigm for accusations of treachery, such as the one that Bonizo of Sutri leveled against Henry IV after his allegedly fraudulent reconciliation with Gregory VII at Canossa. King Henry took communion with the pope while having a hatred of true peace in his heart, thus confecting a fraudulent bond and opening himself to Satan,

16. Philip Augustus's 1188 charter ratifying the commune (*institutio pacis*) of Laon refers to language from an original charter that Louis granted in 1128, including the monarch's conformation of the grant by means of an oath or *sacramentum* to the city's oath community. See *Charte communale de Laon*, 14–19.

17. Ivo of Chartres, *Epistolae* no. 77, PL 162:99C, to the clergy of Beauvis counseling against "pacts, customs (*consuetudines*), and also oaths (*juramenta*) that are against canon laws and the authorities of the holy Fathers"; and 253, 259A-B, to the bishop of Amiens on the divinely inspired royal *pactum pacis*. Oexle, "Peace through Conspiracy," 305 and 307.

18. Philippe Buc, *The Dangers of Ritual: Between Early Medieval Texts and Social Scientific Theory* (Princeton, NJ, 2001), 24–28.

"as with Judas after the morsel of bread."[19] Alain Boureau has shown that by the thirteenth century certain scholastics had conflated sacrament and pact so convincingly that diabolical pacts could be treated as inverse sacraments.[20] In fact, the reversed sacrament was a specter that Cyprian had raised as early as the third century. It takes diabolical form in the twelfth century, in Guibert of Nogent's descriptions of quasi-Manichaean rituals in Soissons and in Hugh of Saint-Victor's assertion that the devil also offers sacraments. While Guibert describes choreographed reversals of the Host—a child tossed hand to hand over flames, whose ashes are then turned to bread—inversion could also take place through wrongful intention during the formation of a seemingly legitimate concord.[21] According to Hugh, diabolical sacraments were oaths that created Satan's army: they played on superficial desires and insisted on immediate reciprocity between members.[22]

When members participated in bonds through love of immediate gain, they bore out fears from the eleventh century that a false sacrament would confederate unbelievers with mammon, and through mammon with the devil. Thus, Stephan of Tournai (1128–1203) described a communal bond as members sticking together scale upon scale, echoing Isidore of Seville's denunciation of congregations that come together without emotional and spiritual commitment.[23] Stephan was complaining to the archbishop of Rheims that the commune of Tournai had refused to accept outside arbitration in a dispute with its bishop and a local church, this despite Philip Augustus's order that it abide by the decision of the bishop of Arras and the castellan of Lille. To rouse the metropolitan against the menace posed by secular resistance, Stephan warned that his fellow clerics were living among dragons (*dracones*) and ostriches (*strutiones*), beasts with a scaly (or feathered) hide: "If among the churches it is permitted to those who should serve to serve by some secular jurisdiction, under the name of commune, scale will cleave to scale among them, so that no breath escapes through."[24] This insensible unity

19. Bonizo of Sutri, *Liber ad amicum* 8, ed. Ernst Dümmler, MGH LDL 1: 610: "ut Iude post bucellam."

20. Alain Boureau, *Satan the Heretic: The Birth of Demonology in the Medieval West*, trans. Teresa Lavender Fagan (Chicago, 2006; Fr. orig. 2004), 60–67.

21. Guibert, *Monodies* 3.17, 430.

22. Hugh of Saint-Victor, *De sacramentis Christianae fidae* 1.8.11, PL 176:312A-313C.

23. Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiarum sive originum* 8.1–8, ed. W. M. Lindsay, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1911).

24. Stephen of Tournai, *Ep.* 99, in *Lettres d'Étienne de Tournai*, ed. J. Desilve (Valenciennes, 1893), 299: "Quod si iurisdictione aliqua seculari liceat eis in ecclesias sevire, qui debuerant servire, sub nomine communie, inter eos squama squame adiungitur, ut nec spiraculum incedat per eas." See Oexle, "Peace through Conspiracy," 290.

calls up the image of "the scales [of Leviathan that] stick together," from the book of Job, and popularized by Gregory the Great.[25] Job's imagery of a body "like fused shields and compressed with scales, joined so that no air can pass between them," became an image of wicked confederacy. It describes the unthinking officials of an infidel monarch in John of Salisbury's *Policraticus*. John also conflated the scaly hide with the devil's body, a receptacle of false peace. He asserted that unless a ruler stood up to such "members of one body sired by the devil," there would be "no mutual peace or merely peace in which bitterness is most bitter, even though all call it peace."[26]

The oath community of the commune expressed a false peace that papal reformers had seen as constant persecution of the church: a corruption of sacraments ecclesial and political, which began at the level of imperial captivity and then pervaded and subverted all manner of friendships and client relationships. But even among observers who did not reject imperial sacraments, the communard pact constituted an inversion of social bonds, bonds that should potentially extend to all Christians through imitation of the exemplary bond between humanity and God. Le Mans, the earliest chartered French commune, provided the paradigm for this subversion: from a series of muddled and oppressive pacts, the commune arose, simultaneously calling for peace and liberty.[27] In 1070, the townspeople first revolted against the Norman duke William (the Conqueror) and their bishop, his ally, Arnald, whose rule in the city may have been compromised by the fact that he was the son of a priest.[28] Then they invited the Margrave of Este to rule over them. Forbidden entry to his own city, Arnald worked out a peace with the populace. The margrave fled, but his ally Godfrey of Maine began an oppressive reign. In response people swore an oath (*sacramentum*) of mutual succor and imposed a charter on Godfrey. Finally, they drafted the bishop himself to lead their army against recalcitrant nobles. William ultimately ratified their communal charter after a series of peace negotiations.[29]

Associating peacemaking with rebellion and liberation, the Le Mans communards created a separate community of the sacrament and called for a just

25. Job 41.6–7 and 41.14. Cf. Gregory, *Moralia in Job* 33.28, ed. Marcus Adriaen, CCSL 143B:49.

26. John of Salisbury, *Policraticus sive de nugiis curalium et vestigiis philosophorum* 6.1, PL 199:591C-D.

27. Oexle, "Peace through Conspiracy," 302–304.

28. *Gesta domni Arnaldi* 33, in *Actus pontificum Cenomannis in urbe degentium*, ed. A. Ledru and G. Busson (Le Mans, 1901), 375 and 376 (gallica2.bnf.fr Collection: Archives historiques du Maine).

29. *Gesta Arnaldi*, 376–381, gives the full description of the conflict between the men of Le Mans, Arnald, William, and Godfrey.

peace. But, according to its critics, by forcing local rulers to cooperate in the new arrangement, the Le Mans commune pretended peace while presenting violence. The *Deeds of the Bishops of Le Mans*, written in the twelfth century, evokes the familiar tropes of perverted sacraments and violent community:[30]

> When therefore a conspiracy had been made *which they called Commune*, they bound themselves mutually with sacraments and compelled Godfrey and other elites of the region—although they were unwilling—to be obligated by sacraments to their conspiracy. Through the audacity of their collective oath (*coniuratio*) they committed numerous crimes, randomly, condemning people without trial, gouging out eyes on the slightest pretext, and—worst of all to recount—hanging people for the lightest offense. Irrationally they would advance on neighboring towns, even during Lent and Easter.

A world turned upside down that called itself *communia* and *pax* seemed to mock the very fundamentals of Christian congregation, illustrated by the leveling of ranks, the compulsion of masters by servants, excessive cruelty, and the mutation of sacraments into enforced conspiratorial oaths.

The late eleventh-century communes that followed Le Mans were also oath-based political associations created by urban freemen (burghers) for the sake of mutual peace. And like the Le Mans commune they relied on agreements with ruling elites. The extensive Pax of Valenciennes (1114) bound and protected members so long as they obeyed a set of internal regulations enforced by the lords of the commune and the Count of Hainault. Additionally, the communal charter guaranteed exemptions from toll and physical protection for persons "within the peace" (*infra pacis*) and merchants trading in Valenciennes.[31] The charter allowed a "man of the peace" (*vir pacis*) to evade a judicial summons from his lord, and even to obtain restitution from a knight if he could find a second member of the peace to support his claim.[32]

---

30. *Gesta Arnaldi*, 377–378: "Facta itaque conspiratione *quam Communionem vocabant* sese omnes pariter sacramentis astringunt et ipsum Gaufridum et ceteros eiusdem regionis proceres, quamvis invitos, sacramentis sue conspirationis obligari compellunt. Cuius coniurationis audatia, innumera scelera commiserunt, passim plurimos, sine aliquo judicio, condemnantes quibusdam, pro causis minimis oculos eruentes, alios vero—quod nefas est referre—pro culpa levissima suspendio strangulantos; castra quoque vicina diebus sancte Quadragesime; immo Dominice Passionis tempore, irracionabiliter succendentes" (emphasis added).

31. See *Paix de Valenciennes*, 100–137. For a description of the commune, see Adriaan Verhulst, *The Rise of Cities in North-West Europe* (Cambridge, 1999), 125–127.

32. *Paix de Valenciennes* 1 and 3, 103–105.

To the dismay of some observers, a set of sophisticated power-sharing agreements implicated rulers in a political form that contradicted the accepted tropes of authority and obedience. The bounding peace of the city may have been "a harmless synonym" for "commune," as Charles Petit-Dutaillis has claimed.[33] However, when applied to this militant and exclusive sacramental organization, the term suggested an alternate and perverse political order masquerading in the language of Christian community.

By the end of the eleventh century, reformist clergy and lay urban communities had begun to share a vocabulary of criticism and resistance that privileged rebellion as a component of authentic peace. The communes' invocation of a redefined peace only highlighted the danger of diabolical parody, a situation not helped by the high medieval city's penchant for producing other inversions of peace.[34] It is no accident that the canons of the Third Lateran Council describe heretics as *patarini*, thus likening them to members of an urban pact similar to the violent insurrectionists of eleventh-century Milan.[35] Often emerging from urban laity and minor priests, heretical groups also made their dominant mode of social protest a demand for true peace. As we have seen, when Evervin of Steinfeld wrote to Bernard of Clairvaux describing an anticlerical movement in Cologne, he noted that their members, while denouncing priests as pseudoapostles, had also proclaimed: "We do not pertain to this world. You lovers of the world have peace with it, since you are of the world."[36] While their conviction impressed Evervin, he claims to have had no doubt as to the heresy of these men, who

33. "Bénin synonyme de commune." Charles Petit-Dutaillis, *Les communes françaises: Caractères et évolution des origines au XVIIIe siècle* (Paris, 1947; repr., 1970), 78, partially translated without citations: Charles Petit-Dutaillis, *The French Communes in the Middle Ages*, trans. Joan Vickers (Amsterdam, 1978), 56.

34. André Vauchez argues that by the thirteenth century, Italian communes and popular religious movements were making explicit calls to peace. In France after 1200, meanwhile, aspirations to peace secreted themselves in confraternities and other modes of "private" devotion. Vauchez, "La paix dans les mouvements religieux populaires (XIe-XVe siècle)," in *Pace e guerra nel Basso Medioevo: Atti del XL Convegno storico internazionale Todi, 12–14 ottobre 2003* (Spoleto, 2004), 321–322.

35. *Concilium Lateranense III*, canon 27.18, *Conciliorum oecumenicorum decreta*, ed. J. Alberigo et al. (Bologna, 1973), 224. In the 1070s, Popes Alexander II and Gregory VII supported the insurrection of the Milanese Pataria, calling for liberation from the diabolical captivity of the Milanese clergy's sinful sacraments.

36. Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistolae* no. 1572, PL 182:678A; for relevant text, see above, chapter 6, note 1. See also Herbert Grundmann, *Religious Movements in the Middle Ages*, trans. Steven Rowan (Notre Dame, IN, 1995), 10; and R. I. Moore, *The Origins of European Dissent* (Oxford, 1985; orig. 1977), 168–172.

separated themselves from clergy and people by taking an alternate sacrament and by refusing to share their peace.

In 1143, Evervin did not have to make any decisions on the fate of the heretics of Cologne: a mob dragged the confessors to a burning pyre. However, by 1180, papal courts and legislation had replaced such ad hoc heresy trials, and bishops commanded proceedings, notably in their capacity as leaders of the once-despised commune. Even then, heretical and seditious uprisings announced themselves as calls for true peace, forcing churchmen to respond in the interests of order and self-preservation. Bishop Hugh of Auxerre anathematized and imprisoned a group led by Durand of Le Puy, whose followers claimed to have received visions of Mary urging them to demand a return to peace. These Capuciati or "White Capes" were men said to be from a variety of statuses, who had banded together under a common oath of peace that simultaneously purified them of past sin and committed them to the forceful eradication of "violence."[37]

Regarded with both admiration and fear by chroniclers, the Capuciati seem to have molded themselves in the manner of crusaders, bearing oath, insignia, and uniform, a parallel remarked on by early thirteenth-century chroniclers, who had watched the "Albigensian" Crusade against the Cathars and Philip Augustus's expulsion of the Jews. The White Capes seem to have been inspired by similar "peace movements" around Le Puy (Anicium) that drove away foreigners and prostitutes.[38] Initial reception was favorable. At the feast of the Assumption, the "serenity of preached peace became evident among the people of the West," says Geoffrey of Saint-Martial of Limoges, prior of Vigeois. By Christmas, he continues, a sworn pact of peace had initiated a new dawn.[39] Rigord's description (likely from around 1190) is equally laudatory: resembling monks with their white capes, and with a mandate from God, the men of Le Puy brought enemies together with tears, embraces, and the kiss of peace. They even inspired an accord between the king of Aragon and Count Raymond of Toulouse, between whom the devil

37. Discussed in Georges Duby, *The Three Orders: Feudal Society Imagined*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Chicago, 1980; Fr. orig. 1978), 328–336. Duby suggests that in fact the White Capes were men of means because they had to pay for their insignia and for membership. See also Vauchez, "La paix," 320–321.

38. Duby, *Three Orders*, 331. For a description of their uniform and insignia, see *Pars altera chronici Lemovicensis* 22, RHF 18:219C.

39. *Pars altera chron. Lemov.* 22, 219C.

had generated an enmity that was almost impossible to placate.[40] According to another account, less favorable, having first cultivated those of his own humble station, Durand then used the Marian insignia to swell his numbers infinitely, drawing overlords (*principes*) from the surrounding towns and castles.[41] The Capuciati's peacekeeping activities included interdicts against gambling, fancy robes, tavern culture, and inappropriate oaths. They forcibly drafted "men of peace" under the badge of the Virgin and Child and executed naysayers and dissenters. Clergy and armed men (*armati*) seem to have joined the movement, which mobilized all who were not bound by vows of stability. The bishop of Le Puy after initial reservations decided to give his support, while ceding charismatic authority to the lowly Durand, the roughhewn vessel that God had fashioned for his decrees.[42] After victories against the enemies of peace in 1183, the peace men entered the royal domain of France, where, according to some accounts, the movement degenerated into rebellion. In the process of combating violence, they turned on seigneurial lords, demanding not peace but liberation.

Georges Duby points out that later reactions to the Capuciati took on the language of carnal repression, assertion of the authority of spirit over flesh. Clergy took up weapons to discipline the social body and rid it of this "disease," and at the head of a group of knights, Bishop Hugh of Auxerre compelled the Capuciati back into servitude.[43] In his universal chronicle that ends in 1211 but may have been updated over a twenty- or thirty-year period, the Premonstratensian Robert of Auxerre dismisses the Le Mans movement as the "novelty (*novitas*) of a certain kind of peace (*quaedam pacis*)," thus conveying that any peace the Durandists claimed to represent was limited to their own concerns and less than authentic.[44] The *Deeds of the Bishops of Auxerre* (terminus ca. 1206) expresses greater outrage at this "excessively horrendous and dangerous presumption" that masqueraded under the insignia of Mary but used her simply as a factional badge.[45]

---

40. Rigord, *Gesta Philippi Augusti* 25, in *Oeuvres de Rigord et Guillaume le Breton*, vol. 1, ed. H. François Delaborde (Paris 1882), 37–40.

41. Robert of Auxerre, *Chronologia*, RHF 18:251.

42. Duby, *Three Orders*, 328–329. Durand was a carpenter and a family man, "of humble countenance but simple and timorous." *Pars altera chron. Lemov.* 22, 219C.

43. Duby, *Three Orders*, 335.

44. Robert of Auxerre, *Chronologia*, 251.

45. *Historia episcoporum Autissiodorensium* 18, RHF 18:729C-D.

Designed to favor the vigorous disciplinary measures of Hugh, the *Deeds* account shows how inversion of familiar and revered elements highlighted the nightmarish scenario. The perversion of symbols mimicked the metamorphosis of the Capuciati from peacemaking to rebellion. While they may have originated in something good, "just as the angel Satan transformed himself into an angel of light when he raised up destruction," the Capuciati were presenting "a feigned appearance of goodness. Indeed, under the pretext of mutual charity they confederated with oaths of protection against enemies, which of necessity brought them mutual aid and counsel against all others."[46] As "ecclesiastical vigor" in Le Puy succumbed, everything was handed over to the Capuciati "at the expense of human peace and the welfare of souls, in banished discipline": heresies sprouted in the fertile ground of carnality.[47] The "pestilence" spread across Auxerre and Berry, overturning men's perceptions of high and low, and playing havoc with the social order. The only alternative for responsible churchmen was to destroy it at its root, as Bishop Hugh finally did with the blessings of his uncle, the archbishop of Sens.[48]

At the forefront of these multiple defenses of peace, against invaders and heretics, bishops had to negotiate anew their relationship between altar and marketplace. Sometimes the only way to do so was to support urban uprisings, as in Bourges and Auxerre. Diocesan associations of the late eleventh century paralleled communes in Italy and France.[49] Bishops acted as military as well as spiritual leaders, and the populace turned to them when confronted by enemies. Politically, bishops faced direct competition from the communes—similarly devoted to protection—unless they repressed them militarily or cooperated by heading the communes themselves. Thus twelfth-century princes of the church were implicated in a system committed to warfare, even as clergy all over Europe had begun to place extreme restrictions on their use of weapons. In Lombardy, as warfare with the empire

46. *Hist. epis. Aut.* 18:729C-D: "quae quamquam a bono habens originem, angelo Sathanae sese in lucis angelum transformante, [cum] exitialia suggereret, simulatam boni speciem praetendebat. Nam, sub obtentu mutuae caritatis, praestitis juramentis confoederabantur ad invicem, quod sibi in necessitatibus suis mutuum ferrent consilium et auxilium contra omnes." Cf. 2 Cor. 11.14.

47. *Hist. epis. Aut.* 18:729E.

48. *Hist. epis. Aut.* 18:729E-730D. The author uses both *pestis* and *pestilentia* to deride the peace movement.

49. Vermeesch, *Essai sur les origines*, 23–77, presents diocesan associations as distinct from communes but insists on their intersection, noting with regard to Bourges: "Les but sont les mêmes ainsi que les moyens de garantie" (47).

escalated in the middle of the twelfth century, communes took responsibility for driving back Barbarossa; bishops who did not become war leaders had to stand aside. At the same time, as Philip Jones has pointed out, the clergy's "subordination" to municipal authorities "was not deconsecration."[50] Even as they encroached on the judicial and administrative ambit of city bishops, communes increased protection for ecclesiastical boundaries, immunities, and powers of appointment, contributing to a demarcation of clerical and lay zones within communities that collectively insisted on peace, justice, and religious devotion.[51]

Twelfth-century clerical attitudes toward the commune demonstrate the extremity of this dilemma, producing grotesque images of communal violence alongside programs for an incorporation of the commune's peace with the peace of God. In the previous chapter, we saw that the church when imagined as the body of Christ placed certain demands for communication between center and periphery so ministers at the threshold could direct new members toward the altar. Cities too acquired a corporeal identity and played out the contestations between spirit and flesh that the Augustinian tradition placed at the heart of a functioning sociopolitical organism. In a truly peaceful civic organism, the spiritual center or ruling church would correctly interpret distress signals from the limbs—that is, the subject populace. The populace in turn could not be blamed for discord, because they were only responding to impulses from the center. When a city gained a commune it took on a sign of reversal, a message of false peace at the center to be read and interpreted before more expressive and bloody signals became necessary.

This meant that the commune could not be ignored: it must be studied like other forms of violence, and like a host of other scandals including schism and heresy, it had its place within the economy of salvation. Guibert of Nogent's reading of the Laon commune of 1114 demonstrates the early incorporation of this oath assembly into clerical visions of urban society and its perversions of peace. Although consistently critical, Guibert's reading of the commune shows how theology and politics reshaped themselves to accommodate this new urban collective.

---

50. Philip Jones, *The Italian City-State: From Commune to Signoria* (Oxford, 1997), 432, and see 335–358, for a description of correlated transformations: the uneven decline of the metropolitan's administrative powers during the first half of the twelfth century, and the claims that communes made regarding defense, blood justice, and eventually monopolistic authority, especially after the *Pax Constantiae* neutralized Barbarossa's advances in 1183.

51. Jones, *Italian City-State*, 423–440; and Augustine Thompson, *Cities of God: The Religion of the Italian Communes, 1125–1325* (University Park, PA, 2005), 104–113.

Vision and Inversion in the Commune of Laon

Guibert's account of the Laon commune presents not a history of urban factionalism and rebellion so much as a model of flawed communication between the church and the world of the marketplace. In the long, drawn-out reconciliation between God and his creation, exegesis was a discipline of mediation: to gradually transform oneself in order to perceive divinity through clouds of flesh required both an intellectual and an emotional commitment.[52] It mimed the correct perception of divine grace, which was, as one exegete put it, a process of interpreting God's two books of creation and redemption.[53] To examine world and text similarly, as analogies or approximations of an unreachable truth, was an act of both spiritual development and political preservation. Illicit oaths, urban insurrection, and civil war could also provide such a text. In Guibert of Nogent's account of the Laon uprising, the tragedy of communal formation amounted to a failure of interpretation on the part of the city's clergy.

An early twelfth-century exegete who trained under Saint Anselm of Canterbury, Guibert, abbot of Nogent-sous-Coucy invites comparisons with his equally idiosyncratic contemporary, Rupert of Deutz. Both Guibert and Rupert were monks who lived at close quarters with scholastics in two major intellectual centers, Laon and Liège. Unlike the pugnacious Rupert, Guibert seems to have had a high regard for the masters who taught here, especially Anselm of Laon. Yet, despite his respect for the dominant intellectuals of his day, Guibert remained an original scriptural commentator ready to improvise from and even parody canonical authorities.[54]

In his autobiographical *Monodies*, Guibert's descriptions of peace and violence derive from the relationship between perception, understanding, and culpability as expressed by Saint Augustine and by Guibert's own mentor, Anselm of Canterbury. According to Anselm, when the eye looks through a piece of colored glass or through water, uncolored, unbroken objects appear to be colored and distorted. The impression the viewer gets is either that the objects are truly colored or broken, or that the outer sense has deceived

52. Jay Rubenstein, *Guibert of Nogent: Portrait of a Medieval Mind* (New York, 2002) is the definitive treatment of Guibert of Nogent's work, and especially of his experimentations with interiority.

53. See Hugh of Saint-Victor, *De sacramentis Christianae fidae*, prologue 1–3, PL 176:183A-184C.

54. Guibert will begin with a recognizable patristic format and then depart into his own pattern of exposition. Hence, his moral commentary on Genesis begins parallel to and then departs from Gregory the Great's *Moralia in Job*. His *Monodies* shows much in common with Augustine's *Confessions*.

the inner sense.[55] In fact, Anselm argues, deception is internal. The outer sense can report only as much as is in its power. At the same time, unable to interpret properly what it receives, the baffled inner sense assumes that the source of distortion lies either with the outer sense or with the object itself.[56] Imposed on the life of a city, this model of sensory reception produced lessons regarding the responsibilities of clerics toward secular society. The clerics, as the inner sense, received several signs that the social organism was in distress: what they could not perceive was that external disturbances were merely the epiphenomena of violence at the center.

Unseen and misunderstood, signs of inverted peace increased until they culminated in the formation and bloody insurrection of the commune. Through bloodshed, Laon became a site of dialogue between the city's body and soul: violence at the spiritual center was finally and grotesquely exposed, when, instigated by their deceitful pastors, the populace mutilated the entire social organism. Guibert assigned culpability to those with intellect and intention, and so while he saw the formation of communes as a blight and a scandal, he blamed their existence on the ruling clergy. For Guibert, church leaders who made illicit pacts and others who permitted these pacts bore the responsibility for social disorder in their cities. Their seditious subjects might be considered blameless, as devoid of intention as limbs in the body of a person whose flesh and spirit were at war.

Although he blamed his own bishop, Gaudry, for the formation and insurrection of the Laon commune, Guibert traced social disorder back to the early bishops of the city.[57] In *City of God*, Augustine had quoted Ezekiel: "If the watchman sees the sword coming, and sounds not the trumpet, and the people look not to themselves, and the sword comes, and cuts off a soul from among them, he indeed is taken away in his iniquity—but I will require blood at the hand of the watchman" (Ezek. 33.6). Augustine told Christians to interpret "watchman" (or *speculator*) as "bishop" (*episkopos*).[58] Such blind and mute watchmen feature heavily in Guibert's explanations of

---

55. Anselm of Canterbury, *De sensum veritate*, in *Über die Wahrheit*, ed. M. Enders (Hamburg, 2001), 26–32.

56. Anselm, *De sensum veritate*, 30. Rubenstein, *Guibert of Nogent*, 13, claims that in *Monodies* Guibert invoked and elaborated on Anselm's psychological models.

57. Guibert, *Monodies* 3.1, 268: "De Laudunensibus, ut spopondimus, jam modo tractaturi, imo Laudunensium tragoedias acturi, primum est dicere totius mali originem ex pontificum, ut nobis videtur, perversitatibus emersisse."

58. Augustine, *De civitate Dei libri XXII*, ed. Bernhard Dombart and Alfons Kalb (Leipzig, 1928; orig. ed. 1909), 16–17.

social disorder. The "perversion" began with Adalbero of Laon (d. 1030), a powerful prelate in the style of Lotharingian bishops, and famous opponent of the Peace of God councils of the early eleventh century. Adalbero is the first of two bishops whom Guibert characterizes as Judas, so called for the betrayal of his rightful lord (the Carolingian claimant Charles of Lorraine) in favor of Hugh Capet, a move that removed Laon from the Lotharingian orbit. Like Judas, Adalbero betrayed his lord on Maundy Thursday,[59] a convenient, if debated, configuration.[60] Future bishops would similarly betray their oaths during Holy Week, perversions that signified the corruption of Laon's church. The recurring motif of Judas underscores the seeming paradox that a sinner's betrayal of God could be part of the events that ransomed man from sin. Like Judas, the villains of Laon represent wickedness changed by God to his own ends, here as training and revelation for the saved.[61] Consistent with the indiscernibility of his judgment, God chose not to deprive Adalbero or his church of material gains.[62] The full impact of Adalbero's initial betrayal of his rightful lord would be made clear to Laon nearly a century later, when the social order was inverted.[63]

If Adalbero's betrayal represented a long-lasting sore, the excesses of Enguerrand, Laon's third bishop, recalled more recent problems for the peace of Christendom. Not only was Enguerrand a simoniac, who had bought his office by turning all church revenues over to the king,[64] he was also negligent

59. *Monodies* 3.1, 268: "Quod facinus die Coenae dominicae instar Judae patravit."

60. Labande notes that Ademar of Chabannes supports Guibert's dating (possibly for similar reasons), while Richer of Reims contradicts it. See *Monodies* 3.1, 268–269n.

61. *De civitate* 18.51, 335–336 (on the need for heretics): "Qui . . . haeretici fiunt et foras exeuntes habentur in exercentibus inimicis. Etiam sic quippe veris illis catholicis membris Christi malo suo prosunt, dum Deus utitur et malis bene et diligentibus eum omnia cooperatur in bonum. Inimici enim omnes ecclesiae, quolibet errore caecentur vel malitia depraventur, si accipiunt potestatem corporaliter affligendi, exercent eius patentiam." *De civitate* 14.11, 28: "Usque adeo autem mala vincuntur a bonis, ut, quamvis sinantur esse possint, sicut Deus ipse verus et summus, sicut omnis super istum caliginosum aerem caelestis invisibilis visibilisque creatura."

62. *Monodies* 3.1, 268–270: "Urbem autem urbisque praesulum temporalis ideo non minus est secuta, Deo poenam differente, prosperitas."

63. *Monodies* 3.1, 268: "Quid enim nequius, quid sibi ignominiosius quam quod dominum suum regem, innocentem puerum, cui sacramentum fidelitatis ille praebuerat, prodidit et exterum genus magni Karoli cursum genealogiae transfudit?"

64. *Monodies* 3.3, 274 (of Enguerrand): "hic, ad sui funestationem introitus, regi universa remisit, quibus trium iam per successionem episcoporum ecclesia caret, pertuoque fortasse carebit. Unde factum est, ut omnes qui secuturi sunt, episcopos huius symoniae participes, sicut mihi videtur, fecerit, qui praesulatum tanta regii metus affectatione suscipiunt, ut repetere non audeant quae ille, ut episcopus fieret, damnabiliter indulsit."

of his duties as pastor.[65] In Guibert's narrative, the egregious Enguerrand is a cleric whose worldly friendships led to a lassitude that destroyed peace; he even sacrificed eternal rest by embracing a relative on his deathbed instead of receiving unction.[66] Enguerrand's failures as watchman showed how a reluctance to defend spiritual peace produced political conflict. The bishop ignored an affair between his kinsman Enguerrand de Boves and Helinande, wife of the Count of Namur. The "secret absolution" of episcopal silence nurtured an evil that grew into something worse.[67] The cuckolded Count of Namur declared war on Enguerrand de Boves and invaded the county of Porcien, which was held by his wife's family.[68] Guibert reports that the results of this butchery were still visible in Porcien, with lootings and burnings everywhere unaccounted for.[69] Enguerrand failed to use the spiritual sword of admonition and thus allowed a military sword to fall on his people.

The shortcomings of these forerunners only hinted at the violence of Bishop Gaudry. During Passover in 1112, playing the part of Judas twice over, Gaudry would betray his allies, aristocrats and commoners, by first granting, and then conspiring to destroy, the commune of Laon. Guibert considered the appointment of Gaudry a failure of discernment. Only the great biblical scholar Anselm of Laon recognized that Gaudry was a false priest.[70] Like several of the Laon clergy, Guibert had remained blind to Gaudry's faults and denied them, even in the face of divine revelations that Gaudry was a courtier masquerading as a priest. Guibert rues his part in a delegation of abbots and priests that persuaded Pope Paschal II to confirm

65. *Monodies* 3.3, 274: "Is cum exors esset totius affectionis in Deum, et omnis ei frugalitas ac religio esset ludibrio . . . omni scurra et coraula deterior, coeperunt diebus eius destructionis urbis illius et ecclesiarum atque totius provincae occasiones emergere; quibus et contigit eum exitus non salubres habere."

66. After this act, he died incoherent, unable to say the required responses (*Monodies* 3.3, 278–280).

67. *Monodies* 3.3, 276: "Quae mollities tantopere adulterinos fovit amplexus, ut, quod generaliter fuerat ligatum, palamque excommunicatum, *furtive absolveret*. . . . Interea, quoniam a radice colubri egreditur regulus, mala scilicet fota erumpunt in peius." For the translation "secret absolution," see Guibert of Nogent, *A Monk's Confession (De vita sua)*, trans. Paul J. Archambault (Philadelphia, 1996), 126. The serpent reference is from Isa. 14.29.

68. *Monodies* 3.3, 276: "Interea . . . quantis quis dicat ille, qui uxorem amiserat, desaevierit caedibus in Porcensem comitatem?"

69. *Monodies* 3.3, 278: "Quis praedas, quis incendia hinc et inde facta enunciet et caetera quae parere hujusmodi tempestas solet, quae tanta fuere, ut mutos faciant referre volentes?"

70. *Monodies* 3.4, 284: "Solus magister Ansellus, vir totius Franciae, immo latini orbis lumen in liberalibus disciplinis ac tranquillis moribus, ab eius [Galdrici] electione dissensit."

the appointment of a simoniac, perjuror, traitor, and murderer.[71] While his fellow abbots, weighed down by Gaudry's bribes, remained mute, the delegation asked Guibert to speak on its behalf. Transported by his own eloquence, Guibert ignored signs that Gaudry was unfit for office.[72] The message should have become clearer at the bishop's ordination, when the first text to which Gaudry turned was Luke 2.35: "A sword will pierce through your own soul." Portentous events were also ignored. One day, while riding with Guibert and a priest to dedicate a church, Bishop Gaudry seized a peasant's spear and using it as a lance, charged off on his horse. The accompanying abbot and priest called out automatically, in Latin and French respectively: "Lance and miter do not combine well; they cannot occupy the same seat!"[73] The vision became intelligible only years later, when Gaudry showed great prowess in arms while defending himself from the Laon commune.[74]

Guibert's blindness expressed the loss of peace among the clergy of Laon, for it marked a disharmony between spirit and flesh. His inability to interpret his own physical responses playfully directs the reader to Anselm of Canterbury's theory of sensory reception.[75] For example, when Guibert saw his bishop snatch a spear and charge, he saw a negation of the trifunctional separation of orders: war, prayer, and labor. The scene looked like a priest deviating from his *ordo* by taking up arms. But in fact the fault was in Guibert's "inner sense." Not truly a priest, Gaudry in fact was acting in character. The scene looked wrong because it was right: the act of charging with lance was natural because the man who charged was not by nature a priest. Later,

71. *Monodies* 3.4, 292: "Quid enim melius quam papae obtemperare praeceptis? Quid pejus quam pro indulta Dei gratia hominibus precio obsequi? Ego tamen talis negotii internuncius vehementer esse perhorrui."

72. *Monodies* 3.4, 288: "Dixi ergo, sub multa oris ac animi suffusione, quae rogitantis sententiae congruerent, sub dictionibus quidem compositis verba tepentia, sed no penitus a vero deviantia." His entire deposition before the pope was a masterly demonstration of rhetoric and circumlocution. He clearly answered questions as to Gaudry's legitimate birth and was honest as far as his own knowledge of Gaudry, while steering away from questions of Gaudry's priestly experience, until so asked. The pope was impressed by the youth's rhetorical mastery and seemed to be questioning him more in order to goad Gaudry's opponents into making a challenge. According to Guibert, the greed of the papal *curia* also disposed them to favor the ambitious courtier.

73. *Monodies* 3.4, 294: "Qua pontifex, tiara quam inter sacra habuerat habens in capite, mox sublata, equum calcaribus urgens, acsi aliquem percussurus intendit. Cui ego et clericus, ipse vulgariter, ego poetice: 'Non bene conveniunt, nec in una sede morantur Cidaris et lancea.'"

74. *Monodies* 3.8, 340: "Plurimum enim suam semper in armis acrimoniam, uti quondam et nunc quoque promebat; sed quia indebite et frustra alium acceperat gladium, gladio periit."

75. See Rubinsten, *Guibert of Nogent*, 38–60, for a more complete discussion of Anselm's and Guibert's psychological models.

during the communal uprising, when he saw the skill with which the bishop wielded the military sword, Guibert understood that Gaudry had been right in grasping the lance but that the abbot and priests had been wrong in giving him the miter.

Visible inversions of what was seen as the right order thus became the means by which messages of disorder reached the religious of Laon; but the clergy's lack of self-awareness meant that several signals passed unheeded.[76] The religious elite stayed blind and deaf even after Gaudry conspired in the death of an unpopular nobleman, Gerard de Quierzy. But it was his pact with the rebellious populace of Laon that sealed Gaudry as a violent bishop. The people of Laon formed a commune and prevailed on the reluctant Gaudry and Louis the Fat for a charter. For Guibert this "new and terribly named" conspiracy encapsulated the lack of peace at the spiritual center of the city.[77] When Gaudry subsequently broke his pact with the commune, the resultant insurrection only gave a voice to the town's perversion.

Founded by greedy town leaders through *amicitia* with the king and bishop, the Laon commune constituted an inversion of political order.[78] While Bishop Gaudry opposed the Laon commune in his heart, he made a false sacrament with the townspeople.[79] Offers of gold enticed him and King

---

76. Inversion is partial, and therefore, perceptible: "Nullius quippe vitium ita contra naturam est, ut naturae deleat etiam extrema vestigia" (*De civitate* 19.12, 393). Explaining Guibert's exegesis on Adam hiding from the Lord (Gen. 3.9; Guibert, *Moralia Geneseos*, PL 156:73D), Rubenstein notes: "The mind has deliberately blinded itself and must be recalled to self-awareness. God's question to Adam fulfills this purpose. He is not asking Adam where he is; God is telling him instead to look at where he is. Only by teaching a mind self-awareness can true penance occur" (Rubenstein, *Guibert of Nogent*, 47).

77. *Monodies* 3.7, 320: "novum ac pessimum nomen." Most translations of Guibert's *Monodies* treat the line differently, but a recent translation provides a reading with which I concur and that supports the argument of this book: "['Commune' was] a new name, and the worst possible one, for what it was," thus signaling the inversion of true community. See *Monodies; and, On the Relics of Saints: The Autobiography and a Manifesto of a French Monk from the Time of the Crusades*, trans. James McAlhany and Jay Rubenstein (New York, 2011), 127. I thank Professor Rubenstein for sending me an advance proof.

78. On political oaths as false *amicitia* (*amicitia* that of necessity will be broken) see Buc, *Dangers of Ritual*, 24–28. In Augustinian social and political theory, earthly government has no business allying itself with factional interests.

79. *Monodies* 3.7, 322: "Cum igitur in eos, qui conjuraverant, et in autores eorum, inflexibili animadversione motum se diceret, voces tandem grandisonas oblata repente sedavit auri argentique congeries. Juravit itaque communionis illius se jura tenturum, eo modo quo apud Noviomagensem urbem et Sanctiquintinense oppidum ordine scripta extiterant." Similar episcopal oaths guaranteed arrangements in Noyon and Saint-Quentin, although Guibert is probably not suggesting that these were also false.

Louis VI into making oaths that were easily broken.[80] Because Gaudry maintained an internal ill will, while outwardly professing friendship, his hatred of the burghers quickly betrayed itself; with no love to check his greed, he exploited the commune by demanding bribes in court.[81] Then he broke his oath and disbanded the commune, just like Judas, on a Maundy Thursday.[82] Alarmed at this, the burghers closed their shops, took to arms, and attacked the bishop and his supporters.

The communal conflict matched its creation, as both were representative of perversion.[83] A Judas in Holy Week, Gaudry had set the example for the carnivalesque violence that followed.[84] Both the episcopal court and the burghers of Laon inverted prevailing conceptions of social and religious order. The nobles and bishop used Parasceve, the day of preparation of souls (Holy Saturday), as the day for preparing murder and perjury.[85] Gaudry assembled peasants to take up arms for him, displaying a facility with weapons that did not suit a cleric.[86] During the uprising, inferiors turned on their superiors and bound themselves with murderous oaths (*sacramenta*).[87] Serfs and servants led the attack on their masters. Stewards betrayed their lords.[88] Rich women and their daughters were forced to pull the carts that carried their dead

80. *Monodies* 3.7, 322–324: "Deus meus, quis dicere queat quot susceptis populi muneribus, quot etiam post praebita sacramenta ad subvertendum quod juraverant controversiae emerserunt, dum servos, semel ab jugi exactione emancipatos, ad modum pristinum redigere quaerent?"

81. *Monodies* 3.7, 324: "Erat sane implacabilis invidentia episcopi ac procerem in burgenses et, dum northmanico vel anglico more francicam no praevelet extrudere libertatem, languet pastor, suae professionis immemor, circa inexplebilem cupiditatem."

82. *Monodies* 3.7, 330: "Ad id pii officii regem evocaverat, et pridie Parasceves, coena scilicet dominica, regem et suum universum populum pejerare docuerat, cui se laqueo primus immerserat. Quo videlicet die Ascelinus episcopus, praedecessor eius, regem suum ut praedixi prodiderat."

83. *Monodies* 3.7, 320.

84. Instead of attending to the consecration of liturgical materials and absolution of the faithful, Gaudry was not seen to even enter the church. *Monodies* 3.7, 330.

85. *Monodies* 3.7, 332: "Haec die Parasceves—quod interpretatur praeperatio—tractabantur, haec sabbatho sacrosancto, in quibus dominic corporis et sanguinis receptui, solis hinc homicidiis, illinc perjuriis animi aptabantur."

86. *Monodies* 3.7, 334; 3.8, 340. See the description above of Guibert's early vision of the militant Gaudry wielding an imitation lance.

87. *Monodies* 3.7, 332: "At inferiorum non jam ira, sed rabies feraliter irritata, in mortem, imo necem episcopi et complicum eius, dato invicem sacramento, conspirat. Fuisse autem quadragenos qui juraverint, tradunt."

88. *Monodies* 3.9, 350 (on the betrayal of Viscount Adon by his servant): "jam ergo eum, cius servus erat, non norat, cui certe inter prandendum paulo ante servierat."

menfolk.[89] Gaudry's own serf Theudegard dragged him to his murderers, summoning his master by the name "Isengrin," the hated nickname that Gaudry had used for *him*.[90] In the actions of servants toward their lords, inversion of right order became clear, and similar episodes complete the image of an upside-down world. Wealthy matrons were forced to dress as nuns.[91] People said an archdeacon was reduced to hiding in a sewer.[92] To avoid their pursuers, men put on women's clothing, and women put on men's.[93] Gaudry's steward and co-conspirator had a vision of his horse inverted, front end wider than the rear, suggesting that now accumulated glory would meet its end in ruin.[94] Most tellingly, in death the militant bishop Gaudry was recognized not by any signs of sanctity but by a scar that he had acquired long ago in battle.[95] In its formation, the commune was a mockery of social order; in its rupture it had demonstrated that a similar perversion existed at all levels of the social fabric.

Only a few years after Guibert's account, Hugh of Saint-Victor described the human self as spirit, flesh, and body in a unbalanced system of commands and obedience. The body, "a subject populace," took commands from spirit and flesh, but it was unable to distinguish which one should have precedence. If the flesh triumphed, and the body obeyed, it could not be blamed.[96] For Guibert, however, the body *was* capable of giving feedback through its actions and sensations. While he used the occasion of the commune to deride Laon's clergy for its blindness to internal violence, he also implied that the populace was responsible for the correction of its leaders. For a city to function as a module of a self that was redeemed and on the path to restoration, the body—its populace—could not remain insensate or docile; irruptions became speech, as long as the center remained poised to listen. Almost inevitably, the body would thrash around too much, and receive chastisement, as had been the case in Laon, and would be in Le Mans. However, in forcing its leaders to chastise, the populace of a city chastised its leaders.

89. *Monodies* 3.10, 358.

90. *Monodies* 3.8, 340–342.

91. The wives of Adon and Raoul the seneschal, and Ermengarde, wife Roger of Montaigu, dressed as nuns and hid in Saint-Vincent abbey (*Monodies* 3.9, 350–352).

92. *Monodies* 3.9, 352.

93. *Monodies* 3.9, 352: "Vir plane muliebrem non verebatur habitum nec mulier virilem."

94. *Monodies* 3.9, 346.

95. *Monodies* 3.9, 354–356.

96. Hugh, *De sacramentis* 1.6.4, 265D-266A.

It is worth noting that by assigning the commune such a brutish mode of expression, Guibert was in fact once again blinding himself and stopping up his ears. By the early twelfth century, communes had begun to confront lay and ecclesiastical rulers with some persistent, sophisticated, and ultimately familiar demands. It would soon become necessary to consider the city as a site for more elaborate conversations, where a commune's conflict merely set the framing conditions for explicit articulations of peace.

The Roman Commune and the Peace of Barbarossa

In Guibert's vision of urban conflict, the commune served as a rebuke of episcopal irresponsibility, of violent tendencies in the church that had gone unheeded. The secret violence of a bishop could be exposed only by a corresponding reaction: overt bloodshed and inversion of order in the marketplace. This dynamic of communication between spirit and flesh was not limited to the mind of an eccentric like Guibert or to the corner of France in which he lived. In Rome itself during the 1140s, communal rebuke of the clergy accused the pope of being a man of violence, and therefore unsuited to be a cleric. Whereas in Guibert's account, the commune had functioned as if without a mind of its own, merely reacting to the presence of evil, multiple observers attest to the fact that the Roman commune and its talisman, Arnold of Brescia, clearly articulated their rejection of the pope on the grounds of lost peace.

The patterns for resistance to captivity that Gregorian reformers had set in the late eleventh century often took on a life of their own. Where once the popes had cheered as the Pataria assaulted their local bishops, by the first years of the twelfth century, lost or misguided peace could also invalidate papal claims to legitimate authority. In 1099, Sigebert of Gembloux excoriated Pope Paschal II for unleashing the armies of Count Robert of Flanders on the disobedient dioceses of Liège and Cambrai. In a striking demonstration of the political resonance of scriptural exegesis, Sigebert announced that he could find no scriptural parallel for Paschal's violent command, which was couched in the language of crusade. Paschal had urged Robert against Liège, saying: "This we order you and your soldiers, for the remission of sins and the familiarity of the apostolic see, so that through these labors and triumphs you shall prevail to the celestial Jerusalem."[97] Sigebert expressed bafflement:

97. Sigebert, *Epistola Leodicensium adversus Paschalem Papam* 13, MGH LDL 2:463 (henceforth *EL*): "*Hoc*, inquit, *tibi ac militibus tuis in peccatorum remissionem et apostolicae sedis familiaritatem precipimus, ut his laboribus et triumphis ad caelestem Ierusalem pervenias*."

"Up to this point, we were depending on the evangelists, apostles, and prophets for testimony. . . . Here, truly I do not know what to say. . . . If indeed I turn over the whole scripture (*bibliotheca*) of either (New and Old) Law and all the ancient expositors of the entire scripture, I will not discover an example of this apostolic precept."[98] Instead, he produced passages to show that by his actions Paschal had inverted his role as peacekeeper and watchman of the earthly Jerusalem:

> Once upon a time, David saw the angel of the Lord standing with a sword extended over Jerusalem. We daughters of the Roman church, behold, we see the leader of the Romans, who is [our] angel of the Lord, standing with a sword extended over the church. David was praying [to the angel] so that the common people (*populus*) should not be killed: our angel, offering Robert the sword, prays that we be killed.[99]

The papal absolution of warfare signified inversion. Paschal had reversed his assigned role as a preacher of peace (*predicator pacis*) where peace was "*regnum* and *sacerdotium* [coupled] into a single cornerstone of concord."[100] Whereas Gregory and his supporters had accepted insurrection and the use of armed force in the interests of liberation from a violent captivity, Sigebert renounced both in the name of quietude. He remarked: "Through the deserts of our sins, the apostle, who should even now pray for the king, even if he is a sinner, so that we may lead a tranquil and quiet life, directs us [instead] in fighting, so that we may not lead a tranquil and quiet life."[101] Peace meant tranquility and quiescence under worldly domination, even by wicked monarchs. Sigebert's adherence to traditional, imperial concepts of peace meant that he rejected any kind of armed resistance, to tyranny and even against heresy, when these involved deviation from one's order or the rejection of divinely instituted royal government.

---

98. Sigebert, *EL* 13, 464: "Hactenus evangelicis, apostolicis et propheticis testimoniis innitebamur. . . . Hic vero quid dicam nescio. . . . Si enim utriusque legis totam bibliothecam, si omnes totius bibliothecae veteres expositores revolvam, exemplum huius apostolici precepti non inveniam."

99. Sigebert, *EL* 2, 452: "Vidit olim David angelum Domini stantem extento gladio super Ierusalem. Nos, filiae Romanae aecclesiae, ecce videmus Romanum praesulem, qui est angelus Domini, stantem extento gladio super aecclesiam. David orabat, ne populus occidederetur: angelus noster porrigens R[oberto] gladium orat, ut occidamur."

100. Sigebert, *EL* 11, 462: "Nisi pax Dei, quae exuperat omnem sensum, copulet regnum et sacerdotium uno angulari lapide concordiae, vacillabit structura ecclesiae super fidei fundamentum." The cornerstone is a reference to Paul's description of Christ as peacemaker.

101. Sigebert, *EL* 9, 461: "Sed peccatis nostris merentibus apostolicus, qui etiam modo orare deberet pro rege quamvis peccatore, ut tranquillam et quietam vitam agamus, agit bellando, ne tranquilam et quietam vitam agamus."

In the middle of the twelfth century, however, the canon Arnold of Brescia combined Sigebert's denunciation of papal militarism with a justification for urban insurrection. Arnold supported the formation of communes against bishops who refused to maintain an acceptable peace. In that sense, we might see Arnold as an exact counterpart of the fiery Hildebrand, who had embraced insurrection and civic discord in order to separate the church from corrupt and worldly overseers. Arnold had led a community of canons regular during the 1130s in Brescia, where he fell afoul of the newly crowned pope, Innocent II, by instigating the townspeople against their bishop, Manfred, and preventing him from entering his own city, a strategy of complaint that was relatively common, and that had presaged the formation of the Laon commune. Condemned at the Second Lateran Council of 1139, Arnold left Brescia and traveled to France, where he continued to make a nuisance of himself by defending Peter Abelard at the Council of Sens against a giant of the church, Bernard of Clairvaux.[102] In the idiom of conspiracy, the Cistercian abbot assailed their bonds of friendship: Abelard and his *armigerius* Arnold together became an insensible, armored creature "joined scale to scale," without room for breath to escape.[103] Bernard's hostility to Arnold persisted long after Abelard's death, and in 1143 he described the canon as having "the head of a dove and the tail of a scorpion," that is to say, pretending peace while he brought destruction.[104]

Romedio Schmitz-Esser has argued that their conflict stemmed from Bernard's desire to liberate the clergy by enhancing its authority in the world, while Arnold's concept of clerical autonomy depended on the submission of clergy to temporal power.[105] If this is the case, the differences must have been relatively nuanced, since Bernard remained acutely alive to the dangers a cleric faced in secular administration. He insisted on the authority of clerics to counsel princes of the church and kingdom alike, but this authority derived from the churchman's relative distance from secular concerns. Bernard's *De consideratione*, a collection of advisories to the Cistercian pope Eugenius, contains regular admonitions regarding the primacy of spiritual concerns, fueled in part by his own misgivings about Eugenius's administrative

102. John of Salisbury, *Historia pontificalis* 31, ed. Reginald Poole (Oxford, 1927), 63.

103. Bernard, *Ep.* 189.3, 14: "Squama squamae coniungitur, et nec spiraculum incedit per eas."

104. Bernard, *Ep.* 196, 51: "cui caput columbae, cauda scorpionis est."

105. Romedio Schmitz-Esser, "Arnold of Brescia in Exile: April 1139 to December 1143—His Role as a Reformer, Reviewed," in *Exile in the Middle Ages: Selected Proceedings from the International Medieval Congress, University of Leeds, 8–11 July 2002*, ed. Laura Napran and Elisabeth van Houts (Turnhout, 2004), 228–230.

aptitude.[106] Yet Bernard saw Arnold's emphasis on clerical quietism to be schism, brought about by a misunderstanding, even misrepresentation, of peace in the world. While Arnold was wandering in exile after his condemnation at Sens, Bernard had written to the bishop of Constance that the Brescian would bring schism and discord wherever he went, the keen sword of his tongue disturbing peace and dividing unity: "Contrition and misfortune lie in his way, and he does not recognize the way of peace."[107]

By 1149, Bernard's predictions of subversion had been borne out when Arnold's criticism of papal worldliness cast him as a leader of the Roman commune that drove Pope Eugenius into exile. Arnold had desired a reform of the church that would return it to an apostolic impoverishment, bereft of worldly possessions, weapons, and political authority, and thus subject to the temporal power. However, in the face of the clergy's unwillingness to adhere to this reform, he urged lay elites to subjugate vainglorious bishops. In response to their spiritual and political enslavement, the Roman people must rise up; the vehicle for this battle for liberation was the republican government of the city. Arnold turned to the Senate as the republic's effective representative, inserting his own reformist insurrection into a struggle for civic autonomy that had begun seven years earlier for completely different reasons.

The Roman commune surfaced in 1142 when Pope Innocent II made too easy a truce during a war with Tivoli. The pope's acquiescence in this undemanding peace appeared to the citizens as a betrayal, and they renounced his authority in favor of that of the Senate. In his brief account of Innocent's life, Cardinal Boso simply states the Roman populace gave in to its love of novelty (*novitas*, which also means "uprising") and raised up a senate against his will using the sop (*velamentum*) of general benefit.[108] To an outsider, Otto of Freising, this sedition was born from the Romans' most irrational and inhuman impulses: to destroy every inch of an enemy city and its inhabitants and to exploit the hostages and the oath (*sacramentum*) they had imposed on Tivoli for the maximum gain and vengeance.[109] By contrast, the magnanimous

106. *De consideratione* 2.6, PL 182:748, on the importance of separating spiritual and temporal jurisdiction, became part of the arsenal of anticlericial writers in the fourteenth century. See the epilogue below.

107. Bernard, *Ep.* 195.2, 50.

108. Laconic as he is, Boso conveys a great deal of disdain here. The term *velamentum* refers to an olive branch, but it is probably also a pun on *velamen*, which means "veil." Boso, *Vita Alexandri* ("Innocentii vita a Bosone cardinali conscripta"), in *Pont. Rom.* 25: 179.

109. Otto of Freising, *Chronicon: Sive historia de duabus civitatibus* 7.27, ed. A. Hofmeister, MGH SSrGs 45:352–353.

Innocent had only been pursuing the secular command that Constantine had bestowed on the Roman pontiffs. Though ready to lead his people in war and to afflict the city's enemies, he had stopped short of excess. The pope now retreated to the Lateran palace, according to Otto to spend his final days in peace, having received a vision of the horrors that were to descend on Rome for the cruelty and insubordination of its citizens.

Innocent's successors Celestine II and especially Lucius II tried to bring the new republic to heel, but having rejected one pope as too timid to pursue their secular interests, the citizens now barred all popes from a part in the administration. The Romans demanded that the pontiff renounce his insignia to the republican leadership (senate and a patrician) and undertake to live only from tithes and alms, like the popes of the early church.[110] In the midst of an attempt to crush the commune with the aid of Sicilian mercenaries, Pope Lucius died; Otto cites exhaustion, while Godfrey of Viterbo repeated a rumor that the pontiff had been killed in battle.[111]

Having put violent tendencies at the center of the republican government, Otto describes its downfall as a series of coercive responses to violence. With the succession of Pope Eugenius III, Rome briefly descended into madness, and then paid for its violence through a painful peace. In an unheard-of manner, the new pope (Otto makes the unlikely claim that he was elected unanimously by clergy and people) had to flee the city immediately to avoid persecution by his own people.[112] The Romans renounced their own prefecture, gave absolute powers to a patrician, attacked lay and clerical elites alike, and turned St. Peter's into a fortress: inversion once again. Pilgrims to the apostolic threshold were robbed of their offerings with lashes and buffets; the halls of the highest temple in Christendom ran with the blood of some who refused. The pontiff finally responded to this violence by turning to the sword: first the sword of anathema, and then the military sword, uniting with Rome's enemies to coerce the citizens to desire peace.[113]

Despite his antipathy to the Roman commune, Otto offers us an insight into how the communards saw themselves. In 1147, the Senate sent Emperor Conrad a letter that gives some indication of how the communards would have imagined and represented their rebellion. Otto quotes the letter in his

110. Otto, *Chronicon* 7.31, 359.

111. Otto, *Chronicon* 7.31, 359; G. W. Greenaway, *Arnold of Brescia* (Cambridge, 1931), 107.

112. Otto, *Chronicon* 7.31, 359.

113. Otto, *Chronicon* 7.31, 360.

Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa, at the same time deriding the Roman appeal as a lot of seductive dirges (*neniae*).[114] The letter assured the sovereign that Roman citizens desired peace and justice with those who also wished it, and that they were keeping the imperial city safe from the treachery of the pope and his Sicilian allies. The Romans claimed that they wished to crown Conrad their emperor, and insisted that their love for him was so great that they would endure any injury on his behalf, keeping faith (*fides*) in the prospect of a father's reward, for they knew he would exact vengeance on their persecutors.[115] The citizens had resorted to a familiar trope by conflating insurrection with Christian martyrdom but reversed the traditional narrative of defiance against imperial persecution so eagerly wielded by papal reformers. The Roman civil war had become resistance to captivity, against the attempts of popes to deny a liberty that was both Roman and imperial.

When Otto first described the commune in his *Universal Chronicle*, he did not know that the pope would eventually turn to Conrad's successor Frederick Barbarossa for help. He also was not close enough to the events to know about the role played by Arnold of Brescia. Yet in Otto's later *Deeds of Frederick*, the violent Arnold serves as a foil to the great peace that Barbarossa would eventually bring, "the storms of war put to sleep," the whole world quieted, a transformation unimaginable.[116] Initially unaware that Arnold was far away in France at the time of the Roman uprising, Otto made him the embodiment of violence: a false prophet whose seditious preaching belied his religious dress.[117] According to Otto, Arnold was driven by republican ideals and a desire to return the Roman senate and military to its ancient glory. Avid for uprising (*novitas*), his mind also moved easily to heresies and schisms. As a heretic, he held unorthodox notions about the Eucharist and infant baptism. As a schismatic, he "persecuted" the clergy, denying them property and even a share of royal revenue and turning the laity against them.[118] Even though Otto had recorded in his earlier chronicle that the Roman citizens had denied Pope Lucius regalia and administrative duties as early as 1143, he now insisted

114. *Gesta Friderici I Imperatoris* 1.29, ed. G. Waitz, MGH SSrGs 46:45–47.

115. The letter is also preserved in the collection of Wibald of Stablo. *Wibaldi epistolae* no. 214, in *Monumenta Corbiensia.* ed. Ph. Jaffé, *Bibliotheca rerum Germanicarum*, 1:331–334.

116. Otto, *Chronicon* 7.31, 359; and Otto, *Gesta Friderici* 1.30, 48.

117. By the time he wrote the second book of the *Deeds*, Otto was willing to acknowledge that Arnold, while a fomenter of other uprisings, only added kindling to a fire that was already raging in Rome. *Gesta Friderici* 2.28, 134, quoting Eccles. 8.4: "Ne in eius ignem ligna struas."

118. Otto, *Gesta Friderici* 2.28, 133.

that Arnold was the one who called for popes to restrict themselves to ecclesiastical courts.[119]

Since our picture of Arnold depends mostly on the perspective of those who wrote about him, it is easiest to examine how he catalyzed the reformist visions of others. Bernard of Clairvaux saw him as an enemy of peace for insisting on clerical submission to temporal authority, and he would continue to use Arnold as the touchstone for all rebels and troublemakers. Otto of Freising treated him as an assault on papal and clerical dignities that would in turn be defended by Barbarossa, of all people. Meanwhile, John of Salisbury integrated Arnold's reproof of clergy into a broader critique of clerical worldliness. No doubt Arnold was disruptive: he created factions and schisms to "prevent peace" between clergy and citizens everywhere he went. At Brescia, he had induced the people to "scarcely open the city gates" to the bishop when he returned from abroad.[120] Excommunicated and declared a heretic, Arnold nonetheless promulgated oaths with the republic of Rome in exchange for aid. Between 1147 and 1149, Arnold stirred up the inhabitants of Rome while pretending to serve a penance in the holy city.[121] Much like Antichrist, he impressed those around him (especially women) through his own austerities and spawned many imitators. John considered Arnold a scandal, possibly a heresiarch, who through unauthorized preaching had developed a sect of "Lombard heretics" in the heart of the pope's city.[122] At the same time, however, he acknowledged that Arnold's disruption was repayment for the captivity of the church under violent priests, and his detailed account of the Brescian's opinions actually gives Arnold the bully pulpit that execution and anathema denied him.

Arnold had proved his disdain for the world through asceticism, scholarship, and vigorous preaching.[123] He excoriated bishops for avarice, immorality, and their attempts "to build God's church in blood" and assailed Bernard of Clairvaux for desiring fame and for his envy of other intellectuals.[124]

---

119. Otto, *Gesta Friderici* 2.28, 134.

120. John of Salisbury, *Historia pontif.* 31:63.

121. *Historia pontif.* 31:65.

122. *Historia pontif.* 31:65. John may be referring here to the Humiliati of Milan, or their antecedents. The movement—devoted to apostolic poverty and preaching—became prominent only around 1175 and was anathematized in 1184. "Lombard heretics" also suggests a direct contrast to Rome, as if the one were now a pollution within the other.

123. *Historia pontif.* 31:63.

124. *Historia pontif.* 31:63. While John does not refer to Bernard by name here, he has identified him a few lines before and now calls him "the abbot whose name has become most well known for

John has no qualms about recording these criticisms. Giving voice to misgivings that several churchmen seem to have had, Arnold also proclaimed that the cardinals of Rome had turned the church into a marketplace and a thieves' den. The pope was an impostor, a false apostle and shepherd who wanted to reduce Rome, that seat of imperial liberty, to a state of servitude. Eugenius III was no priest at all but rather a "man of blood," a pastor who "grazed on flesh" (nihil aliud facit . . . quam carnem pascere) and who had used fire and homicide to hold onto authority. His recourse to physical force and especially his attempts to keep Romans captive denied the pope the obedience and reverence of Christendom.[125]

The uprising of the Roman commune could therefore serve several masters, none of whom may have been particularly interested in the actual demands being made. The communards saw themselves as keepers and defenders of an authentic imperial peace, and willing to share it with those who brought peace to them. Critics treated the bloodshed as central to the violent and subversive motivations that had led to the formation of the republic in the first place. John of Salisbury, on the other hand, allowed Arnold of Brescia his say on the subject of clerical and papal violence. Notwithstanding his famously critical observations of the papal court, John remained a friend to the popes, so he may not have intended a direct attack, but it is clear that Rome's history of violence provided an opportunity to comment on the need for vigilance in the present.

The immediate impact of Arnold's political activity was a temporary reconciliation between papacy and empire, whose relations had been strained since the Investiture Controversy and despite the 1122 Concordat at Worms. In 1152 Eugenius appealed for help from Frederick Barbarossa, the newly crowned king of Germany. The pope greeted Barbarossa's summary announcement of his coronation with a letter that conveyed his "abundant jubilation" at Frederick's unanimous election. On behalf of the apostolic seat, Eugenius approved the news with "benign favor."[126] Frederick seems to have sought neither approval nor favor, but the young Staufer king *was* eager to play the role of Rome's patron and defender. As he approached the city, the Senate sent emissaries who urged him in Rome's voice to greet the citizenry

---

his several merits." Marjorie Chibnall agrees with Poole that this is a reference to Bernard. See *The Historia Pontificalis of John of Salisbury*, ed. and trans. Marjorie Chibnall (Oxford, 1986; orig. 1956), 64n.

125. *Historia pontif.* 31:65–66.

126. *Friderici I Constitutiones* no. 139, MGH Leges Const. 1:194; Jaffé 9577 (6640); I. S. Robinson, *The Papacy, 1073–1198: Continuity and Innovation* (Cambridge, 1990), 461.

in peace so that it would return peace to him. Barbarossa dismissed them for their arrogance.[127] His claims to inaugurate a new era on earth would rest in large part on his ability to pacify the Italian communes and to secure the peace of Rome and its church on his own terms.

The Acceptable Commune

For many clergymen in twelfth-century western Europe, the "new and most inappropriate name" of commune signified an inversion of peace, created through an illicit sacrament.[128] Communal beginnings often involved warfare, either against another city or against the local rulers. The townspeople were obligated to provide mutual protection in times of invasion, and to obey a standard set of town laws one of whose effects was to keep the townspeople poised for immediate defense. Soon, however, lay princes and bishops in the Low Countries, France, and Lombardy found it helpful to have this communal support—either to offset competing authorities in the town or as an advantage during the hostilities between papacy and empire. In Flanders, Count Baldwin's grant to Valenciennes put all his barons under the directive of the *pax*, and pledged to uphold the decisions of a quorum of *iurati pacis* against those who refused to defend it.[129] As self-described "men of peace," members of these urban associations took seriously the impact of civic upheaval on their own fortunes and therefore opposed rebellion and conspiracy. The notary Galbert of Bruges points to a lone "citizen," a certain Lambert Benkin, who participated in a conspiracy among knights to murder the Flemish count Charles the Good in 1127. Meanwhile, merchants and other "men of peace and honor" deplored the loss, for Charles had conferred his peace on the Ypres fairs, attracting commerce and persons from the kingdoms around Flanders. With him gone, the Flemish fairs lost their traffic, and merchants fell victim to marauders like William of Ypres.[130] In France, King Philip Augustus made the strategic use of a communal grant

127. Otto, *Gesta Friderici* 2.29–30, 135–136.

128. Guibert, *Monodies* 3.7, 320: "novum ac pessimum nomen." See the discussion above.

129. *Paix de Valenciennes* (preamble), 100–102.

130. Galbert of Bruges, *Passio Karoli comitis* 16–17, ed. R. Kopke, MGH SS 12:570. See also the more recent edition, *De multro*, ed. Jeff Rider, CCCM 131. Cf. Herman, *Restauratione* 30, 286. Less generous than the city dweller Galbert, the monk of Tournai casts Charles's urban sympathizers as beggars and the infirm, while describing the city as a whole as a den of conflict that had only been tamed by the count's force. For William's seizure of the merchants at Ypres, see Galbert, *Passio Karoli* 20, 572 and 25, 575.

part of his policies of centralization and consolidation, granting communes on the frontiers of his kingdom in order to dispossess rivals and bring local bishops under his authority. Under the Plantagenets, French and Norman communes became feudal entities, committed to defending the rights of members and the monarch.[131] Communal legislation shows that we cannot dismiss the role of princes in the formation of French communes, but the early examples of diocesan associations in Amiens, Corbie, and Bourges also tell of churchmen's experiments with a similar model.[132] Even Italian bishops, understandably leery of oath communities, soon realized that the communes considered them to be their rightful leaders in the resistance to Frederick Barbarossa's invasions.[133] As described in the following chapter, Barbarossa's assault on the Italian communes would catalyze a dramatic transformation in the way these oath communities were received.

For later generations, the commune changed from a defiant signifier of sedition to a pact that could be advertised as true peace. By the thirteenth century, the formation of a commune was a point of origin in civic annals, the expression of freedoms and harmonious coexistence that patterned a city's subsequent history. A foundation story of unremitting bloodshed and civil disobedience would not suit, not even if it were in the interests of moral reform or liberation from diabolical captivity. Communal origin stories emphasized unity and an internal peace that then strengthened the city against outside invaders. The city of Milan dates its commune from the time of its resistance to Barbarossa, not to the insurrection of the Pataria.

By the thirteenth century, the aspirations of peace and mutual concord conveyed by the commune stood in for the commune itself in stories of city foundation. Thus, Giovanni Codagnelli, writing around 1230, begins his

131. Petit-Dutaillis, *French Communes*, 74.

132. Luc Dubar, "Les communes de Corbie et d'Amiens (Amiens 1117–1123)," in *Les Chartres et le movement communal: Colloque régional (octobre 1980) organisé en commémoration du 9e centenaire de la Commune de Saint-Quentin* (Saint-Quentin, 1982), 113, suggests that feudal and royal entities had very little interest or capacity in the formation of peace associations that depended on the church. Pierre Desportes, "Les origines de la commune d'Amiens," in *Pouvoirs et libertés au temps des premiers Capétiens*, ed. Elisabeth Magnou-Nortier (Maulevrier, 1992), 247–265, however, argues that King Louis the Fat played a considerable role in the establishment of the Amiens commune, as did the Capetians in several others.

133. Thompson, *Cities of God*, 105. Hagen Keller notes that this defensive character distinguishes the Italian communes from those north of the Alps. See Keller, "Der Übergang zur Kommune: Zur Entwicklung der italienischen Stadtverfassung im 11 Jahrhundert," in *Beiträge zum Hochmittelalterlichen Städtwesen*, ed. Bernhard Diestelkamp (Cologne, 1982), 55–72, on the difference between German and Italian communes; and the discussion in Adriaan Verhulst, *The Rise of Cities in North-West Europe* (Cambridge, 1999), 143–144.

history of Piacenza in February 1090 with the resolution of a "great sedition," between the knights and the *populus*.[134] It is the only detailed narrative in what is a register of events during the subsequent century. Otto Gerhard Oexle associates this civil war with the commune that was founded at the same time, but as Chris Wickham notes, the author makes no mention of the word "commune."[135] And instead of blaming a commune for the conflict, or even suggesting that it was born of this violence, Codagnelli cites a foundational accord that emerged out of mass conversion. The knights had occupied the citadel, and the populace looked as if it was ready to fight to the death when suddenly, through God's will, both sides stopped fighting each other and exchanged mutual embraces and remorseful tears, all the while crying: "Pax, pax!" The town crier (*praeco*) apparently announced a peace and concord that was then established in the city and the outlying districts of Piacenza. Seen from over a century later, the city of Piacenza founded itself on this moment of reconciliation, divinely inspired, and equally maintained by the *populus* and *milites*.

Aided by suspicion of the commune, the medieval city became a site for imagined communication between the spiritual leaders and their lay ancillaries. But by making conflict the only dialogue between altar and marketplace, this vision of communication limited the role of the commune: it could reflect divine rebuke but little else unless its demands and political benefit were taken seriously. As we shall see in the final chapter of this book, as late as the middle of the twelfth century, the commune continued to serve a semiotic function, with Roman citizens accosting unworthy popes, and Milanese *populani* reflecting the anger of emperors. However, by 1150, a change can be discerned in the city's place in a divinely ordained political system. Rather than expressing disharmony by means of rupture, the commune's municipal government could become a site for the proper expression of humanistic peace, one that inhered in human beings' sense of natural justice and legitimized appropriate coercion from both clerical and lay rulers.

Acceptance of the urban commune as a standard of peace would mark the end of eleventh- and twelfth-century clerical experiments with a pristine peace that maintained altar and marketplace as distinct but interacting

134. Giovanni Codagnelli, *Annales Placentini*, ed. O. Holder-Egger, MGH SSrGs 23:1–3.

135. Oexle, "Peace through Conspiracy," 302; Chris Wickham, "The Sense of the Past in Twelfth-Century City Chronicles," *Land and Power: Studies in Italian and European Social History, 400–1200* (London, 1994), 309.

spheres. Through its procession from an embodiment of false peace to an approximation of true, the commune transformed the vocabulary of its acceptance. For the canon lawyer Rufinus of Sorrento, the tranquility of a functioning municipal government exemplified the Peace of Babylon that all groups shared as familial harmony and civic order.[136] While looking to the celestial peace of Jerusalem, the Peace of Babylon could never achieve it—and yet it was the only feasible peace on earth. Ironically, for the churchmen who had begun their dangerous revisions of peace in the interest of social reform, a peace that included all of society would eventually undermine their own self-image as blessed peacemakers.

136. Rufinus of Sorrento, *De bono pacis*, 2.8–10, ed. Roman Deutinger, MGH Studien und Texte 17:114–126.

CHAPTER 8

Disciplining Behemoth

Provisions for Secular Peace

Late in the twelfth century, a canon lawyer and bishop named Rufinus of Sorrento wrote a two-volume treatise, possibly the first of its kind entirely devoted to peace.[1] In *De bono pacis* (On the Goodness of Peace), Rufinus argued that human beings experienced peace as species of a universal PAX: the peace of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.[2] Reflective of a century in which peace could be treated as true or false, these species of peace also inhered within Satan and associated Satan with humanity. Humanity enjoyed three types of peace, which derived from angelic and diabolical models: the wicked Peace of Egypt, the ideal Peace of eternal Jerusalem, and the communitarian but coercive Peace of Babylon. Egypt derived from a diabolical parody of tranquility, the "sleep of Behemoth," and it should be disrupted by any means available.[3] The peace of Jerusalem, the blessed concord of the ideal church, was nourished by piety and held together by charity. But Rufinus prescribed for humanity *only* the Peace

1. Kiril Petkov, *The Kiss of Peace: Ritual, Self, and Society in the High and Late Medieval West* (Leiden, 2003), 1, calls Rufinus's work "the earliest surviving systematic treatise on the medieval peace."

2. Rufinus of Sorrento, *De bono pacis*, ed. Roman Deutinger, MGH Studien und Texte 17 (henceforth *DBP*).

3. *DBP* 1.8, 76. Cf. Job 40.16.

of Babylon, a peace that shaped city and government, and which must be regulated by earthly devices.

The final chapter of this book describes the intellectual and political changes that shaped Rufinus's systemization of peace. Rufinus's treatise *On the Goodness of Peace* winds up a century of clerical experimentation with turbulent and repressive modes of peacemaking designed to liberate Christians from unseen violence and introduce them to true peace. While essentially denying that peace could be perfected on earth, Rufinus voiced clerical willingness to make peace with the present world, not the one hereafter. Christians could enjoy this peace without feeling that they had settled for a counterfeit or submitted to an unjust captivity.

Rufinus's conception of the Peace of Babylon implicated communes in the totalizing schema of human peace. Accordingly, the context for Rufinus's mundane peace is municipal government. Contrary to Otto Gerhard Oexle's argument that Rufinus classified communes as conspiracies, I suggest that by the 1180s, communes had integrated themselves into a political fabric that supported rather than undermined princely authority.[4] Rather than making communes aspects of wicked (Egyptian) peace, this shift would have made them the engines of a more feasible and flexible peace. Following two decades of conflict between papacy and empire during which Pope Alexander III had turned to secular monarchs for help, Rufinus now asked both clergy and communes to participate in the Peace of Babylon. Perhaps unwittingly, by so doing he sowed the seeds for later political theorists to deny churchmen *any* role in the defense of peace on earth.

As described previously in this book, reformers in the late eleventh-century papacy had justified insurrection as a refusal to be anesthetized with political tranquility in the place of true peace.[5] During the Investiture Controversy, Popes Alexander II, Gregory VII, and Urban II gave monks permission to rebel against an abbot imposed from outside or bishops who were too intrusive; they urged lay reformist movements in northern Italian cities to take over the local churches and deny the sacraments of the ruling bishops; Gregory even excommunicated the emperor and insisted that all Christians

4. Otto Gerhard Oexle, "Peace through Conspiracy," in *Ordering Medieval Society: Perspectives on Intellectual and Practical Modes of Shaping Social Relations*, ed. Bernhard Jussen, trans. Pamela Selwyn (Philadelphia, 2001), 290–291. While communal support for princely authority may have been most visible in France, we can argue this for northern Italy as well, where the ruling prince (in this case usually the bishop) could retain authority, but as guarantor of the commune rather than as the head of the city's church.

5. See above, chapters 2 and 3.

renounce their fidelity to him. Early twelfth-century scholars developed moralistic analogies to this revolutionary peacemaking around them, imagining an insurrection of the captive human spirit against flesh, a state of constant conflict that directed the self away from false peace and toward true.

False peace meant complacency and a refusal to recognize hidden violence: illegitimate rulership, institutional corruption, or treachery. In the early years of the twelfth century, as papacy and empire achieved a series of truces, churchmen turned their suspicions of false peace elsewhere: to the commune, an urban microgovernment in which merchants, knights, and artisans swore pacts of mutual assistance and policing. To some clerics, membership in such a particularistic association meant insurrection against the universal authorities of kingship and priesthood.[6] The sworn communal bond of peace was therefore a perversion of the Christian sacrament.[7] Some observers began nevertheless to slot this perverse government into a broader divine agenda, suggesting that the eruption of communal conflict could serve as a mirror, a guide to deep-seated violence and corruption within a city's ruling church. As communes developed their own municipal institutions, provided kings with support against local princes, or offered bishops positions of leadership, their image among elites began to change. Finally, when relationships between empire and papacy again deteriorated in the second half of the twelfth century, the peace of communes gained a new theological validity, and civic peace became the standard for universal peace.

In the late 1150s the Hohenstaufen emperor Frederick Barbarossa descended into Italy as part of a plan to unite Christians under a single dominion of peace. In their capacity as city governments, the northern Italian communes represented resistance to this "imperial overreach." Frederick and the intellectuals at his court had appropriated the clerical language of turbulent peacemaking, and the emperor was determined to fulfill his duties as a "lord of peace," who would unite empire and papacy in ideal concord, as preparation for the end of days.[8] Forced into exile (with only a brief return to Rome) between 1162 and 1177, Pope Alexander III relied on secular

6. On the communal bond as a violation of universal fraternity, see Oexle, "Peace through Conspiracy," 285–322, esp. 306.

7. See above, chapter 7.

8. Fredrick's multiple military engagements in the decade following his coronation have been read as a political "grand design" by scholars like Peter Munz, *Frederick Barbarossa: A Study in Medieval Politics* (Ithaca, NY, 1969), who would see them driven first and foremost by strategy and second by an imperial (i.e., Augustan) ideology of subjugation. By contrast, Knut Gorich argues that Frederick embarked on these conquests—and especially the Lombard expeditions—as a matter of honor (*Ehre*):

monarchs and the Lombard League, a confederation of communes loosely controlled by Milan, to protect the interests of the Roman church. The prestige of the commune increased even further, and the communal pact could no longer be regarded as a perversion of Christian peace. Instead, it became a model for how peace must be administered on earth: humanity should live under a civic peace or commonwealth that set the pattern for home, city, and world.

For Rufinus, a canon lawyer and associate of Alexander, the universalism of this "Peace of Babylon" came from the common humanity of all persons and their instinct toward natural justice. An ideal peace could operate only once civic peace had been realized and maintained to its fullest extent, if necessary by cruelty and antagonism toward those who undermined it. By making the mundane and coercive Peace of Babylon a religious imperative, Rufinus simultaneously rebutted the grandiose ambitions of Barbarossa and asked churchmen to embrace rather than simply tolerate the messiness of earthly politics and governance.

Context: Transformation of the Commune

Clerical aspirations for harmonious concord between altar and marketplace changed the image of the commune for members and outsiders. For many clergymen in late eleventh- and early twelfth-century Europe, this "new and terribly named" oath community was an inversion of peace, created through an illicit sacrament.[9] Communes emerged in the towns of France, the Low Countries, and northern Italy toward the end of the eleventh century, often accompanied by warfare, either against another city or against the local rulers. At the outset, a commune was simply an oath community in which the townspeople were obligated to provide mutual protection in times of invasion, and to obey a standard set of town laws. Members would sue local rulers for official charters of immunity not very different from those routinely acquired by monastic orders. Lay and clerical rulers soon realized the advantages: by granting the charter, they got a share of municipal fines

---

not simply personal honor but the "honor of *imperium*." See Görich, *Die Ehre Friedrich Barbarossas: Kommunikation, Konflikt und politisches Handeln im 12. Jahrhundert* (Darmstadt, 2001), 186–302, with reference to the Lombard communes. To this "cultural" explanation should be added the overriding concern with a universalizing peace among Frederick's biographers, a concern that (as we shall see) seems to reflect the emperor's own interests.

9. See above, chapter 7.

and established their own authority at the expense of a local rival.[10] During Barbarossa's invasions, Italian bishops began to administer the peace of the commune rather than oppose it.[11] By the end of the century, canon lawyers were presenting the commune not as a manifestation of hidden violence but instead as the secular embodiment of peace.

While communes changed in terms of outside perception they also responded to criticisms about disorder and immorality in cities. By 1200 the Mass had become a central element in the expression and activation of municipal unity and harmony, sacred spaces received special protections, and communal assemblies took on the vestments and aura of religious confraternities.[12] Begun as local oath communities, communes now controlled municipal administration. In Italy, the commune produced a new sociolegal subject group, the *popolo*, and created a new set of leaders, the *podesta*, who ensured that the citizens of the commune maintained the peace to which they were pledged.[13] While these changes can be explained in terms of the commune's increasing strategic importance and stature, the character of the transformation suggests an evolution of the commune's position in the Christian order, a position that the members had begun to take seriously. The mundane peace of the commune had become a clerical bulwark against imperial ambitions for ideal and absolute peace.

Frederick Barbarossa's Terrifying Peace

Since the Investiture Controversy no ruler had deployed the vocabulary of universal peacemaking like Emperor Frederick I "Barbarossa" (Red Beard). Eighty years after Pope Gregory VII and King Henry IV of Germany had accused each other of perverting the truth of peace, Barbarossa's supporters crafted a new image that combined the pacific qualities of high priest and

10. Philip Augustus made the strategic use of a communal grant an integral part of his policies of centralization and consolidation, granting communes on the frontiers of his kingdom in order to dispossess rivals and bring local bishops under his authority. Philip's charters mention previous grants by his grandfather, suggesting communes played a part in Louis the Fat's expansion of the French monarchy.

11. John Kenneth Hyde, *Society and Politics in Medieval Italy: The Evolution of the Civil Life, 1000–1350*, New Studies in Medieval History (London, 1973), 58; Augustine Thompson, *Cities of God: The Religion of the Italian Communes, 1125–1325* (University Park, PA, 2005), 105–106. According to P. J. Jones, *The Italian City-State: From Commune to Signoria* (Oxford, 1997), 335–336, the power sharing did not last beyond the mid-thirteenth century.

12. See Thompson, *Cities of God*, 108ff.

13. Jones, *Italian City-State*, 374–375.

emperor in one uncompromising war leader. In 1152 Frederick began his reign as peacemaker to a turbulent empire, and then carried the mandate of peace into his conquest of the communes of northern Italy. These actions earned him enemies in Rome, most famously Cardinal Roland Bandinelli, who became Pope Alexander III in 1159 but only received imperial recognition after a twenty-year conflict.

The quarrel over who should be pope caused an actual and symbolic tearing of the mantle of Petrine authority in 1159. A new discourse on peace and violence emerged around these contests, one in which clerics and laymen traded positions on what constituted an acceptable peace. Emperor Frederick deployed not only the old imperial claim of "lordship of peace" but also more recent clerical vocabulary that presented peace as emotional discipline and forceful upheaval.[14] Pope Alexander demanded "liberation" of the church from lay domination and used the revolutionary rhetoric of the Gregorian reform, but he went well beyond Pope Gregory VII in sharing the church's peace with secular rulers. From the perspective of Barbarossa's supporters, meanwhile, this "antipope" had resorted to conspiracy and schism: perversions of peace.

The presentation of the emperor in Otto of Freising's portion of the *Gesta Frederici* makes the young ruler herald of a new dawn, an era of peace after a time of tribulation and conflict. As Sverre Bagge points out, when the first two books of the *Gesta* are read as a coherent and predetermined portrait, Frederick's appearance (at the end of the first book) and his coronation (at the start of the second) have been prepared by a lugubrious account of chaos in the empire.[15] The young king's peace provides a contrast to the "short-lived and illusory" version that had deluded Christendom before the calamity of the Second Crusade.[16] Embracing these representations, Barbarossa brought peace to the Roman Empire on multiple levels, reconciling the universal powers and also great ruling families, pacifying warring duchies in the Rhineland and Denmark through harsh military reprisals, and even summoning cowed antagonists to a royal hearing (*placitum*).[17] He declared

14. On the emperor as "lord of peace" in Investiture Controversy polemic, see Ian Robinson, *Authority and Resistance in the Investiture Contest* (Manchester, 1978), 89–109.

15. Sverre Bagge, "Ideas and Narrative in Otto of Freising's *Gesta Frederici*," *Journal of Medieval History* 22.4 (1996): 349.

16. Ibid., 371.

17. Otto of Freising and Rahewin, *Gesta Friderici I Imperatoris* 2.4–2.5, ed. G. Waitz and B. von Simson, MGH SSrG 46:105–106. I am grateful, as always, to Guy Lobrichon, for his advice to look closely at Otto's conception of peace.

a *Landfriede* (territorial cessation of hostilities) throughout the empire and mediated between his relatives Henry Jasomirgott and Henry the Lion in their dispute over the duchy of Bavaria, allowing that region "its share" of the imperial peace.[18] Having made peace politically, he also made religious peace by deciding a disputed election to the archbishopric of Cologne. Otto notes that by virtue of bringing peace to the entire empire, Frederick became not only Augustus but also *pater patria*, father of the nation in the manner of the ancient Caesars.[19]

The young Frederick was setting the pattern for his peace, which was doled out in accordance with the dictates of justice rather than affection—a sharp contrast to his Salian predecessors, who had been rebuked for their misguided friendships. Otto, Frederick's stepuncle, reads this balanced attitude into his nephew's every gesture. Shortly after the sacrament of coronation, Barbarossa refused to reconcile with a client who had previously caused offense; the king declared that this was not from hatred but rather from a love of justice, which Otto cites as an example of Frederick's "constancy."[20] As Bagge notes, "*Constancia* is the supreme virtue of the ruler"; in the *Gesta* it associates Frederick with God.[21] At the same time, Otto's portrayal of the constant Frederick presents him as supreme *cleric*, a rector who balances the attributes of king and high priest in order to unite the universal powers.[22]

While Otto associates Frederick with Christ through his ability to return peace to the world, the young king also exemplifies the supreme cleric through his own internal peacefulness. Frederick is "a cornerstone," whose birth conjoined the rival families of the Hohenstaufen (later Ghibelline) and

18. *Gesta Friderici* 2.7, 107. Finally in 1156, Frederick convinced Jasormirgott to cede territories to him and not his opponent, thus avoiding dishonor. By agreement, he then turned these over to Henry the Lion at the Diet of Regensburg, with swords drawn but without bloodshed. *Gesta Friderici* 2.55–56, 160–161.

19. *Gesta Friderici* 2.56, 161.

20. *Gesta Friderici* 2.3, 104–105.

21. Bagge, "Ideas and Narrative," 352.

22. Medieval criteria for the balanced rector rely on Gregory the Great's highly influential *Pastoral Care* and his highly copied *Moralia in Job*. Carole Straw, *Gregory the Great: Perfection in Imperfection* (Berkeley, 1988), 179–193, discusses Gregory's struggles with balancing the mind-set of a monk with that of a prelate. See also John S. Ott, "'Both Mary and Martha': Bishop Lietbert of Cambrai and the Construction of Episcopal Sanctity in a Border Diocese around 1100," in *The Bishop Reformed: Studies on Episcopal Power and Culture in the Central Middle Ages*, ed. John S. Ott and Anna E. Trumbor (Aldershot, UK, 2007), 137–160, for invocations of Gregorian balance in the propaganda of a late eleventh-century bishop.

the Welf (later Guelf).[23] He was consecrated alongside the new bishop of Muenster, also named Frederick, demonstrating the conjunction of New and Old Testaments, and of kingship and priesthood within the same sacrament. Such a felicitous coincidence made it seem as if the supreme king and priest Christ were also rejoicing at the ceremony.[24] Like a cleric, Frederick modulated his emotions, bringing peace to others only after he himself had attained it. If forced to do battle to pacify his subjects, Frederick ensured that he had first made peace with God.[25] When roused to anger, Frederick got not irate but indignant, and to an appropriate degree; unlike his retinue, he avoided the madness (*furor*) of the fighting orders. When insulted by papal legates at an imperial diet at Besançon, Frederick, though annoyed, restrained his own men, sent the legates home with safe conduct, and noted to the pope his *debitam indignationem*.[26]

Though internally serene, Frederick produced disruption through what can only be described as vigorous peacemaking. The young king's efforts to produce a "bond of peace" remained unsuccessful in Saxony, so he exercised royal prerogative by appointing a new archbishop to Magdeburg. Inevitably, relations with the papacy got off to a poor start. In a letter (reproduced by Otto), Pope Eugenius III rebuked the imperial bishops for allowing the investiture, and for obeying a secular prince rather than divine will. Instead of seeking harmony between clergy and people in the choice of incumbent, they had tried to court temporal favors, capricious as the wind and a danger to the church's liberty.[27] Contrary to the aspirations of his relatives and courtiers, the emperor's actions had reminded the papacy that the pursuit of peace could not be entrusted to a layman, who lacked the cleric's constancy and discernment.

For Otto, however, the king displayed perfect judgment through the propriety of his emotions. Always appropriate, Frederick's anger justified force against those who aroused it. The great fear it inspired increased rather than decreased his ability to quell disharmony among German princes and Ital-

23. *Gesta Friderici* 2.2, 103. Cf. Eph. 2.20.

24. *Gesta Friderici* 2.3, 105: "in una aecclesia una dies duarum personarum, quae solae novi ac veteris instrumenti institutione sacramentaliter unguntur [iuguntur?] et christi Domini rite dicunteur, vidit unctionem." See Bagge, "Ideas and Narrative," 351–352, on the relationship between this incident and the constancy that associates the ruler and God.

25. *Gesta Friderici* 2.11, 113.

26. *Gesta Friderici* 3.10–11, 176–179.

27. *Gesta Friderici* 2.6, 107; and 2.8, 108–110 for the papal response (Jaffé 9605).

ian cities.[28] The internal dissensions, disobedience, and inherent violence of the cities of the future Lombard League explained the severity with which Frederick attacked northern Italy. During his Italian campaign, the ineptitude, pride, and possible treachery of Milanese consuls made Frederick indignant, but the anger arose from no trivial cause, because these men had been trying to corrupt his soldiers with bribes. Barbarossa punished the city appropriately, and the Milanese propitiated his anger by blaming their own consul and destroying his house. In the same way that it reflected divine anger, popular upheaval also choreographed itself to royal anger; it justified itself mimetically, as an articulation of Frederick's just emotions.

According to Otto, the inherent "violence" of Lombard cities had necessitated Frederick's assault on them. Their increasingly sophisticated structure breathed violence, for they overturned the rightful order of governance. The communes were so powerful that cities had become the foci of authority: bishops had been compelled to dwell in them, and no magnate (not even an imperial client) could avoid becoming part of a city's *contado*. Their desire for republican liberty, admirably Roman if expressed in moderation, had driven the populace to turn over all governance to consuls rather than to the will of the ruler (*imperans*).[29] Once the rightful order had been overturned, Lombard citizens became arrogant. Milan had the audacity to oppress its neighbors Como and Lodi. The Milanese seduced the city of Tortona to support the depredations. Pavia suffered a worse fate, oppressed by antagonist pacts because of its own violence: specifically, treachery during peace conferences, and a refusal to accept the lordship of an imperial count palatine. Otto's impression of sociopolitical bonds in Lombardy must have had some currency in the empire; Frederick's solution after conquering these cities was to outlaw all pacts save his overarching Peace of Milan.

In this atmosphere of conflict, Milan's allies were paying the price for being "confederated with an evil city," for even their sacraments had failed them. Protesting their innocence with regard to Tortona's crimes, the clergy of that city declared:[30]

> It is to be lamented that we have not the freedom to serve God at the sacred time of the Lord's passion, for we are not able. . . . We stand

28. *Gesta Friderici* 2.42, 151.

29. *Gesta Friderici* 2.13, 116–117. (*Imperans* should here be taken to mean "one who exercises imperially sanctioned rulership, rather than rulership by election.")

30. *Gesta Friderici* 2.25, 128: "magis dolendum est, non nobis hoc sacrosancto dominicae passionis tempore Deo servire libert, quia nec licet. . . . Non securi in lectulis, non in oratior inperculsi, animum ex periculorum instantia distractum ad offerendum Deo sacrificium pacis colligere pacificum non valemus."

> unsafe at the lecterns, not free of fear during the sermon; and for the offering of peace, we cannot summon a peaceful spirit that is abstracted from immediate dangers.

Styled in this way, Frederick's brutal attacks on the communes of Lombardy were a blessing because they woke up the citizens to their own internal violence and forcibly liberated them from the embrace of wicked and false friends like Milan. Even the pope turned to Barbarossa to restore peace when the Roman commune rose up and drove him out of the city.[31] While Frederick remained in Italian territories, the rebellious communes were slowly brought to peace, and during this campaign Lombard territories and Rome were joined in an alliance with the empire. As proof that he was essential to a just peace, after Barbarossa returned to Germany, Milan rebelled and imposed an excessively harsh peace pact on Pavia; and so, the Lombards returned to their conflicts. Thus Otto said of Frederick: "Just as his presence brought peace back to the Franks, in the same way his absence removed it from the Italians."[32]

Imperial Peace and the End of History

Frederick Barbarossa accepted the responsibilities of peacemaker, but the demands of his peace were too great. He ascended to the German throne lauded by churchmen, who saw his arrival as a stage in the renewal of the primal church, a circulation of history that at the same time pointed to its *telos*. In his *Universal Chronicle*, Otto embraced this vision of the end of history brought about by the unification of German empire and Roman priesthood. In this work of history and prophesy, written before Frederick's reign, Otto departed from Saint Augustine's vision of history in *City of God*. Augustine had envisaged the present and final age as a long waiting period in which there would be no more clues to the *eschaton*, the end of time. Otto predicted instead that the approaching culmination of Roman authority under one emperor would remove all obstacles in the way of Antichrist.[33]

While Augustine's metaphorical Jerusalem and Rome referred to a moral condition, mixed from the very beginning, Otto's cities had united in the

---

31. See above, chapter 7.

32. *Gesta Friderici* 2.51, 158. The sentiment is strikingly similar to that of Herman of Tournai, who treated warfare in Flemish cities as proof of the strength of the departed Charles the Good. Cf. Herman of Tournai, *Liber de restauratione monasterii sancti Martini Tornacensis* 30, ed. G. Waitz, MGH SS 14:286.

33. Brett Whalen, *Dominion of God: Christendom and Apocalypse in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2009), 91–92.

course of earthly time, after Constantine had Christianized the Roman Empire. Otto believed that German imperial authority, in a harmonious concord with the Roman papacy, would hold together the elect and reprobate in the world's final age.[34] All that was required was a monarch strong enough to maintain this unity, and popes willing to cooperate with this vision of peace. A few years after Otto wrote the work, King-Emperor Frederick seemed to have fulfilled his prophecy. Otto was cautiously optimistic if unwilling to commit utterly to the millennial moment.[35] Master Gerhoh of Reichersberg, renowned biblical exegete, shared Otto's nuanced eschatological vision. An ardent supporter of Frederick during his troubles with the papacy, Gerhoh, like Otto, respected the papal reforms of Gregory VII, but recent popes had disappointed him. Gerhoh expected his king to prepare the world for last days, to restore peace in the church, as Gregory had, so that it might deal with its final persecution: clerical corruption. The blame for this corruption lay with Roman pontiffs like Hadrian IV and Alexander III and their allies in Sicily, England, and France. With them out of the way, the world could await the final silence, the ultimate peace at the end of time.[36]

Popular discourse at the imperial court was less circumspect. The *Ludus de Antichristo* (ca. 1160) dramatizes medieval Apocalypse commentaries, describing a ruler of Jerusalem who relinquishes his crown at the Mount of Olives before the arrival of Antichrist. Antichrist himself is then crowned by hypocrites and tangles the princes of the earth in an all-encompassing peace, a state of false security before the complete destruction of the universe.[37] In the play, emperor and Antichrist are defined by their attitudes toward violence, and by the bonds that they create as they pacify the world. The emperor secures his dominions by asserting the historical primacy of Rome

34. Otto of Freising, *Chronica sive historia de duabus civitatibus*, ed. Adolf Hofmeister and Walther Lammers (Darmstadt, 1961). On Otto's break from the Augustinian temporal model, see Marie-Dominique Chenu, "Theology and the New Awareness of History," in *Nature, Man, and Society in the Twelfth Century: Essays on New Theological Perspectives in the Latin West*, ed. and trans., Jerome Taylor and Lester K. Little (Chicago, 1968; Fr. orig. 1957), 176–190; and Hans-Werner Goetz, "On the Universality of Universal History," in *L'historiographie médiévale en Europe*, ed. Jean-Philippe Genet (Paris, 1991), 256–261.

35. Whether Otto considered his nephew's reign to mark a definitive end of history is debatable. See Bagge, "Ideas and Narrative," 348n.

36. Gerhoh of Reichersberg, *De quarta vigilia noctis* 12, ed. E. Sackur, MGH LDL 3:511.

37. *Ludus de Antichristo*, in *Der Antichrist: Der staufische Ludus de Antichristo*, ed. Gerhard Günther (Hamburg, 1970) (henceforth *LA*). Also see a transcription, facsimile, and edition in *Ludus de Antichristo*, ed. Gisela Vollmann-Profe, 2 vols. (Göppingen, 1981). An English rendition (slightly altered for literary purposes) is *The Play of Antichrist*, trans. John Wright (Toronto, 1967).

over all other kingdoms and resorts to arms only when bellicose peoples, like the Franks, oppose his assessment of rightful order.[38] Antichrist, on the other hand, instructs his ambassadors to threaten temporal princes with force and fear in God's name, only considering other tactics when the enemy is too warlike to oppose militarily. Antichrist then resorts to seduction, having his minion Hypocrisy shower rival kings with wealth before setting on them his mark and a kiss of peace.[39] Claiming divinity, Antichrist wins over the wary and battle-hardened Teutonic king, who has announced that only blood will secure lost rectitude; Antichrist makes him his general, who must convey all heathens by force.[40] At the end of these battles, when the Jews have been deceived and the walls of mighty Babylon have fallen, and after he has persecuted God's messengers Enoch and Elijah, Antichrist summons his client kings, and declares "universal peace and security," a signal that in fact total destruction is at hand.[41]

In the imperial polemic, the Roman emperor's open but restrained use of force stands against the hidden violence and false declarations of peace by the Son of Perdition. The contrast illuminates what Philippe Buc has identified as a "central paradox of Christian dogma," the concomitance of peace and war.[42] God himself presents a readiness to turn to both peace and warfare, a feature of divine justice that survives the transition from Old to New Testament. In the section of the play that I have discussed, we may read the emperor as embodying the appropriate expression of divine anger, while Antichrist merely mimics it.

It is likely that Antichrist is supposed to be a cleric, and a reformer in the Gregorian mode.[43] He conceals his armor and sword under a white robe, and makes a great show of humility, while also criticizing secular priests. The reference may be to then antipope Alexander III, formerly Roland Bandinelli, who had been at the forefront of papal-imperial tensions since the latter half of his predecessor Hadrian IV's tenure. Indeed, alongside his peacemaking projects among the Italians, Frederick faced even greater and more universal

38. *LA* 11.61–25.116, 102–110.

39. *LA* 49.195–60.233, 128–134.

40. *LA* 15.285, 142.

41. *LA* 102.414, 154: "pax et securitas universa conclusit"; cf. 1 Thess. 5.3.

42. Philippe Buc, "Éxègese et violence dans la tradition occidental," *Annali di storia moderna e contemporanea* 16 (2010): 133–135.

43. Whalen, *Dominion of God*, 91, suggests that the hypocrites are Gregorians as well. The hypocrites' job is to seduce secular princes, while heretics ensnare the clergy.

threats to peace: the tearing asunder of the papal mantle, and the rebel papacy of Alexander.

Approaching the Alexandrine Schism

Frederick's relations with the papacy first broke down thanks to his own overreach in northern Italy and a series of diplomatic indiscretions with Pope Hadrian IV; both sides then blamed each other for disrupting peace. The most famous incident is a blunder by papal ambassadors at the imperial diet in Besançon during October 1157. Legates Bandinelli and Cardinal Bernard of S. Clement read out a letter that called Frederick's empire a *beneficium* of the papacy. Most likely they meant that the empire benefited from papal sponsorship, but, perhaps deliberately, Barbarossa's adviser Rainald of Dassel translated the Latin *beneficium* into German as *Lehen* (feudal benefice).[44] A feudal claim over the empire was unthinkable, and Frederick's nobles reacted angrily, which was the emperor's cue to display a pacific contrast, restraining a count who had drawn his sword, and giving the legates safe conduct to Rome, as long as they went straight back without stopping with any bishops along the way.[45] Frederick then circulated a letter in which he presented himself as the upholder of peace, harassed by a papacy that was fomenting conflict.

Frederick claimed that he had developed "appropriate indignation" on hearing the letter, but that, even as the princes around him had given way to madness (*furor*) and anger (*ira*), he had intercepted undue action. He reminded the pontiff that divine authority had conferred on "imperial arms" the duty to maintain peace in the church.[46] In turn, the pope should behave with a father's gentleness to cultivate the unity of church and empire, to join them in a bond of peace, and to direct other spirits toward obedient concord with the conjoined universal powers. Instead, from the head of the church where "Christ had impressed his image (*caracter*) of peace and affection," there now poured forth a poison of dissension and wickedness that threatened to ruin the entire body.[47] Frederick even accused the legates of carrying multiple copies of the unfortunate letter, in order to "strip the altars" and "carry away

44. Marshall Baldwin, *Alexander III and the Twelfth Century*, The Popes through History 3 (Glen Rock, NJ, 1968), 34–38. *Gesta Frederici* 3.8–11, 172–179.

45. *Gesta Friderici* 3.10, 177.

46. *Gesta Friderici* 3.11, 178.

47. *Gesta Friderici* 3.11, 178.

the vessels of God's house," images of violence and depredation commonly used by importunate monks to assail invidious local lords.[48] The vocabulary of lost and endangered peace so effectively wielded by clergymen had now been appropriated to support the imperial claim of sovereign peacemaker. There was even a barely veiled threat that the Barbarossa would be forced to bring his "imperial arms" to bear if the papacy endangered the church's peace: "We would prefer to incur the danger of death rather than bear opprobrium for such great disturbance during our time."[49]

While it makes for a good story, a mistranslation could not have been solely responsible for the eruption at Besançon. Friends of the empire blamed the legates for deliberately concocting a disruption of peace between Frederick and the papacy. According to the *Gesta Frederici*, while pretending sincerity, Bandinelli and Bernard concealed a great deal of mischief that they had then brought into Frederick's inner sanctum, where he had retired to escape the tumult outside. The *Gesta*'s continuator Rahewin contends that Rainald of Dassel had provided an interpretation "fida satis," sufficiently adherent to the papal missive, and consistent with its generally obstreperous tone.[50] The letter demanded that Frederick punish a Burgundian brigand for kidnapping a Scandinavian archbishop who was returning from Rome: "The impious men, worthless seed, profane sons, with drawn swords [had] violently ploughed into him and his companions."[51] Frederick's lassitude and indifference to this sacrilegious violence could only be read as a grievance against the Roman church.

Since Besançon actually lies in Burgundy, the legates *could* have chosen a less disruptive time and place. Nor should they have been optimistic of success, since Frederick had recently married the daughter of the Duke of Burgundy.[52] But through their exaggerated outrage at the papal faux pas, imperial courtiers were gesturing toward other disturbances of peace. At Benevento in 1156, the pope had made a treaty with Duke William of Sicily that imperial advisers saw as a violation of the Treaty of Constance between Hadrian and Frederick, which specified that Barbarossa could make no peace

48. *Gesta Friderici* 3.11, 179.

49. *Gesta Friderici* 3.11, 179.

50. *Gesta Friderici* 3.10, 176.

51. *Gesta Friderici* 3.9, 174: "viri impietatis, semen nequam, filii scelerati, in eum et in suos evaginatis gladiis violenter exarserint." Cf. Is. 1.4.

52. See Constance B. Bouchard, *Sword, Miter, and Cloister: Nobility and the Church in Burgundy, 980–1198* (Ithaca, NY, 1987), 33.

with the Sicilians without papal permission.[53] The Benevento agreement likely originated with Cardinal Roland, who is mentioned in the letters of concord, and who was pushing for alliances south toward the Norman kingdom of Sicily and away from Barbarossa and his Lombard subsidiaries.[54] Some saw this breach of trust as part of a *coniuratio*, a sworn pact of subversion. Even a source from anti-imperial Milan admits that Hadrian had extracted oaths from the Milanese, Brescians, Piacenzians (Placentines), and eventually the Cremonese that "hereafter they would not swear a peace (*paciscerentur*) or make any other kind of concord with Emperor Frederick without the permission of Pope Hadrian or his Catholic successor."[55] Gerhoh of Reichersberg insists that shortly afterward at Anagni, as the old pope's health deteriorated, his advisers deepened the conspiracy against Frederick and agreed in *coniuratio* that the Sicilianist party in the curia would appoint Hadrian's successor.[56] Thus Roland Bandinelli, villain of Besançon and Anagni, attained the Roman see in an atmosphere of extreme discord and suspicion, the epitome of false peace in the eyes of Frederick and his advisers.

Pope Alexander III as Defender of Peace

Pope Hadrian died on September 1, 1159.[57] The so-called *coniuratio* of Anagni pointed to the controversial Roland as Hadrian's successor. Frederick's representatives in Italy pressed instead the claims of Cardinal Octavian, an imperialist who had defended the papacy during the uprising of the Roman commune; he had also tried to mediate between pope and emperor during their troubles. According to Peter Munz, radicals on both sides caused the disputed papal election to descend into chaos.[58] Otto of Wittelsbach, a

53. See Baldwin, *Alexander III*, 28–29 and 33. In retaliation for the papacy's alliance with Sicily, Frederick had indeed been sulking, refusing to address what the papacy would have regarded as violence, most likely in order to provoke the kind of confrontation that took place at Besançon. In a charged atmosphere, any misstep could be exaggerated so as to blame one side or another for the loss of peace. The loaded term *beneficia* was only the final gesture of a more extended choreography.

54. See the two letters of concord between William of Sicily and the pope in *Pont. Rom.*, 352–356. Baldwin, *Alexander III*, 32–33, discusses the process and the immediate political impact of the treaty on central and southern Italy.

55. *Annales Mediolanensis* 18, ed. G. H. Pertz, MGH SS 18:368: "exinde non paciscerentur, vel aliquam concordiam facerent cum Federico imperatore, absque licentia Adriani papae, vel eius catholici successoris."

56. Gerhoh, *De investigatione Antichristi* 1.53, ed. E. Sackur, MGH LDL 3:361. Munz, *Frederick Barbarossa*, 203, accepts Gerhoh's suggestion of a conspiracy.

57. Boso, *Hadriani IV vita*, in *Pont. Rom.* 2:368.

58. Munz, *Frederick Barbarossa*, 205–213.

protégé of Rainald of Dassel, insisted on breaking the conspiratorial pact of Anagni, expecting that Octavian's Tusculan credentials would bring the clergy and people of Rome over to the emperor. The imperial party insisted on transporting Hadrian's body from Sicily to Rome for a funeral at St. Peter's.

After the funeral, the imperial and Sicilian factions negotiated for three days, with all indications that a compromise would be made on the fourth. Overnight, according to Munz's reconstruction of events, Roland's faction acted and pressed the papal mantle on their candidate, who seems to have been reluctant to pursue such a course. When Octavian physically intervened, a fight ensued, and the mantle was torn. At this point, Otto of Wittelsbach entered with his soldiers, and his chaplain presented a second mantle, this time to Octavian, who received it and became Pope Victor IV.[59]

Cardinal Boso, Alexander's chamberlain, relates the events with a different emphasis: the papal mantle, though torn, remained wearable, but Octavian, unable to usurp it, had had to settle for an imitation. Boso alleges that Octavian, mad, rash, and a robber, was so eager that he tore the original off Roland-Alexander's shoulders. When he tried to carry it away, however, a senator rescued it from his grasp. Only then did the disappointed Octavian snatch the replacement that the chaplain of Wittelsbach had brought. Fittingly, he ended up wearing it backward, flailing around to straighten it while others laughed at him—an inauspicious, ridiculous, but clearly readable beginning to a false papacy.[60]

On October 28, 1159, Roland wrote to his supporters in Bologna as their new pope Alexander III. He conflated the torn mantle with a rending of Christ's undivided tunic and accused Octavian-Victor and his friends of violent incursion on Saint Peter's patrimony.[61] The layman Otto of Wittelsbach he accused of schism, simony, invasion, and "violent tyranny."[62] Alexander insisted that the church had been created as a singular entity, head and members, whose coherence allowed it to benefit from the continued presence of the Savior. In such a way had Christ also comforted Peter on a storm-tossed boat as the disciples feared their master had abandoned them. Alexander, the

59. Ibid., 210–211. Munz here relies on the concordance between a letter from Cardinal Bishop Arnulf of Lisieux and a treatise on the schism favorable to Roland-Alexander. Assuming his reconstruction is correct, both sides must have foreseen this struggle and were hoping to gain the moral and situational upper hand from the confrontation.

60. Boso, *Vita Alexandri*, in *Pont. Rom.* 2:378–379. Critics of Gregory VII had described a similarly farcical ascent to the throne of Saint Peter.

61. Alexander III, *Epistolae* 19, PL 200:89C: "patrimonium beati Petri violenter invasit."

62. Alexander, *Ep.* 19, 89D-90A; and *Ep.* 20, 92A.

first of the lawyer popes, argued that Christ's presence inhered in the statutes and orders of the church. Octavian, made pontiff against the canons, had ripped apart the Lord's garments and rendered the ship of the church rudderless and prone to capsizing.[63]

Alexandrine descriptions transformed the respected Octavian into a raving madman, whose *passiones* better suited an armed *laicus* than a cleric. As discussed previously with respect to Sigebert of Gembloux's condemnation of Paschal II, Guibert of Nogent's disparagement of Gaudry of Laon, and even Arnold of Brescia's attack on Eugenius III, the language of violence delegitimized a cleric's claim to high office, with conflict and unbridled anger testifying to a deeper irrationality and unsuitability. Accusations of clerical violence generally indicated not armed force but usurpation, the imposition of illicit bonds of obedience that perverted charity into alliance, conspiracy, and domination—a corruption of love that would be paid in kind. Alexander's supporters claimed that Octavian's invasion of the papacy had thrown Rome into uproar and brought out the old belligerence of the commune. According to Boso, Rome's women and children called Octavian a bastard, thief, and heretic. A citizen named Britto assailed the usurper: "What are you doing, Octavian, you lunatic, the death of the fatherland. How dare you divide Christ's tunic? Soon, soon you will be dust and ashes; you live today, tomorrow you will die."[64]

As Rome divided over the disputed election, the polemic of the Investiture Controversy reappeared among the factions. Like Hildebrand-Gregory a hundred years before, Roland-Alexander had acquired a reputation as a hard-liner for ecclesiastical liberty. When Frederick called a church council to decide the disputed election, Alexander publicly urged him to free the church instead. While acknowledging the emperor as Rome's advocate above all others, the pope deplored the council as an attempt to deny the honor of Peter and the Roman church.[65] In Alexander's absence, the council at Pavia awarded the papacy to Victor. Rumors of the sworn conspiracy between Hadrian, Roland, and their advisers helped justify the decision. Like any commune, the papal *coniuratio* was an insurrectionist pact that militated against the universal peace of the church.

---

63. *Gesta Frederici* 4.61, 299–300.

64. Boso, *Vita Alexandri*, 380: "Quid facis insane patriae mors Octviane! / Cur presumpsisti tunicam dividere Christi? / Iam iam pulvis eris, modo visis, cras morieris."

65. Quoted in Boso, *Vita Alexandri*, 383–384. Cf. Jaffé 15597.

In the face of imperial attempts to paint Roland as an enemy of peace, his supporters leveled the same accusations at Frederick and derided his occasional overtures of peace as misleading. The pope and his circle meanwhile shaped an image of peace different from that of the German king. Alexander's numerous letters close with the same formula: "When his servants have gathered in the same place under his law, insomuch as they reap the fruit of good action, and earn the rewards of eternal peace before a severe judge, let there be the peace of the Lord Jesus Christ."[66]

Since his curia only had a contingent and ephemeral presence, the pope relied on such peace to safeguard the unity of his geographically dispersed faithful: the church united through singularly directed actions that were underwritten by God's peace. His legates were advised to behave with restraint at all times.[67] Where Frederick exemplified peace through constancy, Alexander III displayed his peace through discretion, appealing for similar discretion in others.

The pope needed a delicate touch to explain why, though "toiling and praying" for peace, he had persisted in a conflict that was ripping the church apart.[68] While pointing out that he had been reluctant to gain office through coercion, Alexander asked that Christian princes recognize the simoniacal and uncanonical "invasion" of Octavian and his fellow schismatics.[69] He repeated the formula *schismaticus, simoniacus et manifestus invasor* in appeals to Queen Bertha of France, and the diocesans of Beauvais, Rheims, and Salzburg, insisting that by opposing fidelity to Peter, the imperial party had "violated" Catholic unity.[70] Before his landmark Council of Tours, Alexander described what he wanted to Alfonso II of Aragon: honor of God, exaltation of the church, salvation and peace for all.[71] At the council, Bishop Arnulf

66. "Cunctis autem eidem loco sua jura servantibus, sit pax Domini nostri Jesu Christi, quatenus et hic fructum bonae actionis percipiant, et apud districtum judicem praemia aeternae pacis inveniant." Alexander's time spent among Cistercians may have helped him understand the value of this approach to unifying a "virtual" community.

67. Baldwin, *Alexander III*, 183–184.

68. Cf. Boso, *Vita Alexandri*, 447.

69. To Henry of Beauvais, PL 200:80B: "Although we remain reticent, our prudence does not ignore your discretion. [You must have heard] how the schismatic, simoniac, and manifest invader Octavian insinuated himself, when after our canonically valid election by the will of the brothers, Prior Deacon Odo had dressed us, even as we hesitated." Also PL 200:81A, 82A, 85B.

70. Alexander, *Ep.* 6, 80B; *Ep.* 7, 81A; and *Ep.* 16, 85B.

71. E. Martin-Chabot, "Deux bulles closes originales d'Alexandre III," *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire, École française de Rome* 24 (1904): 65–74.

of Lisieux announced that the "violence of tyrants" was destroying liberty, making the church wretched.[72] An institution in such bondage was worse than no institution because it ensnared Christians in a false concord, whereas the true, invisible church could never lose its freedom.[73] For this reason, if nothing else, the pope must resist the emperor's attempts at a so-called peace, until there could be a peace where disciples had no need to overbear their masters.[74]

The language of resistance at Tours teetered between insurrection and nihilism, but Alexander was able to maintain an aura of restraint. The warfare he refused was conducted for him by heaven and by the commune. Alexander's biographer explains the pope's enforced retreats by a love of peace in the face of persecution. After Octavian's death, Alexander returned to Rome, where in 1166 Frederick besieged him in what Cardinal Boso terms a "violent assault." After the defenders of "Saint Peter's house" repelled his bowmen, Frederick set the apostolic basilica on fire.[75] Boso alleges that unable to break through even after this sacrilege the emperor resorted to trickery: he promised a "secure peace" as long as the pope abdicated and allowed him to pick a replacement acceptable to all parties. Unwilling to give up office for a peace born of cunning and seduction, the pope again slipped out of the city.[76] After Alexander's retreat, however, his rivals for the papacy died of gangrene or horse-riding accidents, and Frederick's entire army was ravaged by a plague that even killed Rainald of Dassel.

The tenure of Alexander saw the once-reviled communes come into their own as God's strong right arm, repeatedly punishing imperial princes and bishops when they violated the peace of the papacy. They performed the salutary bloodletting from which the pope had restrained himself. From 1167 to 1177, the emperor felt the full weight of the Lombard League's armies, and the *caroccio*, war chariot of the northern communes, became the symbol of Milanese resistance to imperial hegemony. After emperor and pope had finally made peace, the Lombard citizenry then punished those nobles who had made deals and pledges with Barbarossa.[77] Its turbulence and pugnacity

72. Mansi 21.1170: "violentia tyrannorum." Robert Somerville, *Pope Alexander III and the Council of Tours (1163): A Study of Ecclesiastical Politics and Institutions in the Twelfth Century* (Berkeley, 1977), 16–17.

73. Mansi 21.1169: "Immo deterius est miseram esse, quam non esse"; also 21.1170: "impossibile est suam ecclesiae Dei tollere libertatem quam Dominici sanguinis consecravit effusio."

74. Boso, *Vita Alexandri*, 407.

75. Boso, *Vita Alexandri*, 405.

76. Boso, *Vita Alexandri*, 406–407.

77. Boso, *Vita Alexandri*, 445–446.

notwithstanding, the commune had become a defender of—and thus a participant in—the church's peace.

Alexander III's Discretionary Peace

His years in exile forced Alexander to visit more of Peter's patrimony than his predecessors, and this contributed to a policy wedding ecclesiastical universalism with circumspection in secular affairs.[78] From his refuge among Cistercians in France, Alexander had initially denounced lay incursions on church property in the same terms (*violentia*) that he had used to protest Octavian's election.[79] Nevertheless, in the face of Frederick's animosity, Alexander had to pursue alliances with Sicily, France, and England; he could not overbear kings like Henry II when it came to the liberties of the church. This was no Gregory VII, inflexible defender of ecclesial freedoms, but instead a statesman, who understood that a cleric's discretionary powers should also equip him for the present world. Alexander's attitude toward secular politics and polities can be explained partly by his need for allies against Frederick and by his training as a canon lawyer, but it hinged on his understanding of the truth of peace on earth. Although contemporaries like Thomas Becket grew exasperated with what they saw as the pope's weakness in the face of royalty, Alexander had a distinct vision of ecclesial liberty that rested on the ability of the papacy to constantly modify, and not be bound by, the peace it made with the secular powers.[80] There should be no eternal and unchanging peace with temporal authority; instead the *saeculum* demanded from the church a measured and modulated peace.

By 1176, Frederick was ready to meet Alexander on his terms, and both parties began to use the phrase "true peace" to signal acceptable agreement.[81] Alexander's requirements for this true peace demonstrate the extent to which

78. Baldwin, *Alexander III*, 177–186, considers the impact of peregrination on Alexander's papacy, including his extensive use of correspondence and embassies. Baldwin does not place enough emphasis, however, on the fact that secular monarchs and the emperor also lacked geographical stability at this time, often conducting their business in the field or at diets established at the frontiers of their domains.

79. See for example Alexander, *Ep.* 18, 88A.

80. Alexander often had to maintain a balance between Becket and the English bishops who wanted him removed. In a letter reinstating the archbishop's apostolic commission, Alexander gently admonishes him "to mitigate and temper [himself]" during a time of crisis, and not to "impede or disturb the peace of the church" by confederating with its tyrannical enemy Frederick (through enmity with Alexander's ally Henry). Alexander, *Ep.* 31; Mansi 21.892.

81. "Pacem veram dare" appears as the operative phrase in letters from both sides. Boso, *Vita Alexandri*, 432 and 433.

the church had embraced secular instruments as a component of, not an impediment to, its ultimate victory. The pope insisted: "If [Frederick] wants to give the whole peace (*integram pacem*) to us and the Roman church, he needs to give it to all our auxilliaries."[82] Alexander refused to countenance any changes in the laborious peacemaking process without first consulting the Lombard League, and insisted the eventual treaty, enacted at Venice, include separate truces for Sicily, the Lombards, and the Greeks. Boso explains: "The church's peace should not be made without the peace of those who stood firmly with the church against the empire."[83]

Although proceedings concluded amicably with the kiss of peace, this was not a perfect peace but an accommodationist one. Frederick seems to have refused to lead the pope's horse as per tradition, but Boso explains it away as Alexander's choice; the emperor ignored the pope's overly precise description of him as "foremost among all the other princes of the world."[84] The peace oaths, sworn collectively by the imperial princes and the papal allies, included peace provisions that were not intended to be eternal; the truce with Sicily was to last only fifteen years, that with the Lombards a mere six. Yet these arrangements are described in the language of ideal peace. The church rejoiced in the treaty as an example of true and most sacred (*sacratissimam*) peace—harmony between church and empire restored. As a consequence of the peace between the universal powers, schismatics and heretics regained their senses and returned to the fold; the head of their "synagoge" (*archisynagogus*) fled in terror.[85] The earth, said the treaty, should "rejoice that it is refreshed by the arrival of such desired dew, that it is made fertile by such gracious rainfall," which quenched the thirst of the faithful and the fires of discord.[86] But how distant from Pope Gregory VII's call for the arid faith to be watered by drops of martyr blood.

Alexander's tenure was one of the longest in history and colored much of the latter twelfth century in western Europe. His term conducted in exile almost two-thirds of the time, its legitimacy rested on the reputation of the pope as a keeper of peace and his ability to provide an alternative to the peace that Barbarossa claimed to be offering. To do so while still fomenting schism, conflict, and revolution required an extremely skillful deployment

82. Boso, *Vita Alexandri*, 433.

83. Boso, *Vita Alexandri*, 439.

84. Boso, *Vita Alexandri*, 441 and 432, respectively.

85. Boso, *Vita Alexandri*, 442, 447.

86. Boso, *Vita Alexandri*, 444.

of peace. Alexander's beloved "discretion" required different degrees of restraint from worldly instruments, and different criteria for "true peace" for church and for secular dominion. He insisted that peace hinged on the liberty of the clergy to police their own, and on the primacy of canon law when the affairs of clergy and laity became entangled. But to be assured of their own peace, churchmen must also provide for secular peace and abstain from secular administration except where it pertained to themselves or other *pauperes*.[87] The result was religious provision for a secular sphere dominated by monarchy and commune. These determinations were codified in the Third Lateran Council of 1179, which delegates from remote corners of the Christian world attended.

Taking their cue from the lawyer pope, the conveners of Lateran III were far more concerned than their predecessors with categorizing Christian modes of living. The conciliar canons focused on the clerical sphere and established papal primacy vis-à-vis all other clergy, giving the pope flexibility to determine how much authority each metropolitan could have over those below him. Alexander even wanted to keep the various clerical orders in separate spheres and therefore, as Marshall Baldwin points out, the provisions intrude but little on the authority of abbots.[88] Where Lateran III instituted standards for laymen as well as clerics, peace was the common concern. Tournaments were forbidden, and several Peace of God provisions were dusted off to grant clerics, merchants, and even peasants immunity from harm. Armed resistance to brigandage and piracy was considered defense of the peace and hence received the same spiritual protections as crusade. The council allowed similar coercive methods against heretics: Cathars and "Patarini."[89] Lateran III also pushed another group to the margins: the Jews, whose testimony in legal cases would count for less than Christians.[90]

It is tempting to read the council as part of a process by which governmental, judicial, and social institutions sanctioned violence against outcast groups—but such a sea change in Western attitudes should not be equated,

87. Baldwin, *Alexander III*, 193.

88. Baldwin, *Alexander III*, 193–194. However, Baldwin argues that here too Alexander was circumspect. He did not rescind any monastic exemptions, but he also did not increase them any more than his predecessors had done.

89. *Concilium Lateranense III*, canon 27, *Conciliorum oecumenicorum decreta*, ed. J. Alberigo et al. (Bologna, 1973), 224.

90. *Concilium Lateranense III*, canon 26, 223–224. The provision against the Jews can be read in one of two ways: as official sanction of a "persecuting society," or as a delayed (and somewhat feeble) attempt at creating Jews as persons under the law, as had been done centuries ago in the Islamic world by the Pact of Umar.

as R. I. Moore tends to do, with mysteriously self-directed, rationalizing processes of state formation.[91] The provisions speak to a broader clerical self-imagining, forged in papal-imperial conflict: the creation of a new social sphere in which religious, social, and political disharmony were equally violations of peace. The association of state formation and persecution makes sense only when we understand that the state was first articulated in terms of this new sphere, which the canonist Rufinus of Sorrento would call the Peace of Babylon. Rufinus's treatise *On the Goodness of Peace* therefore becomes our touchstone when considering the intellectual changes that shaped clerical sanction of coercion by the state.

The Peace of Babylon

The convocation address at Lateran III emphasized that the pope, not the emperor, was the highest official in the church, with the sole authority to summon a general, ecumenical council.[92] The man who made the statement, Rufinus, bishop of Assisi and later Sorrento, was likely also the canon lawyer Master Rufinus, who posited the spiritual autonomy of ecclesial powers from secular jurisdiction.[93] In his commentary on Gratian's *Decretum*, this Master Rufinus had argued similarly to Alexander III that the emperor was an advocate of the church, who had administrative powers but not supreme authority: that is, while priests should obey the emperor in worldly matters, he could not judge them.[94] The emperor was first only among temporal princes, and he justly wielded the military sword only on the instance of the clerical authority. In *On the Goodness of Peace*, Rufinus explored this distinction along lines more theological than canonical.

Writing around 1176, even as pope and emperor were moving toward an accord, Rufinus circumscribed clerical and lay jurisdiction using the familiar rubric of peace. Rejecting the eschatological visions of Otto of Freising and

91. R. I. Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Authority and Deviance in Western Europe, 950–1250* (Oxford, 2007; orig. 1987).

92. Baldwin, *Alexander III*, 187.

93. In this I follow Yves Congar, "Maître Rufino et son *De bono pacis*," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 41 (1957): 428–444.

94. Rufinus, *Summa decretorum*, ed. H. Singer (Paderborn, 1902), 192. Opinion by means of commentary on the *Decretum* was standard practice for canon lawyers (decretists). See Ian Robinson, *The Papacy, 1073–1198: Continuity and Innovation* (Cambridge, 1990), 300; and Francesco Maiolo, *Medieval Sovereignty: Marsilius of Padua and Bartolus of Saxoferrato* (Delft, 2007), 149, for succinct descriptions of Master Rufinus's distinction between the pope's supreme right of *auctoritas* and the emperor's power of *administratio* that precluded secular judgment of the pontiff.

Gerhoh of Reichersberg for the more workaday concerns of Saint Augustine, he rebutted the universalism of Frederick Barbarossa's peacemaking claims. Rufinus presented a taxonomy of peace that included angelic and diabolical modes, some beyond the reach of humanity. He also provided a zone of accommodation. Since the world could not achieve the blessed peace of Jerusalem, it must be satisfied with a decent one, the Peace of Babylon. Unlike Carolingian ecclesiologists who had interpreted Augustine's images of Jerusalem and Babylon in a polarized manner (church and world respectively), Rufinus suggested that both clergy and laity had roles in the maintenance of earthly peace, and neither should restrain themselves from coercion.[95] They would not be approximating ideal, spiritual peace at all, simply executing a module of the universal category of peace to the full extent of that module's limitations.

Rufinus's work resembles a treatise written around the same time by another supporter of Alexander, the English scholar and later bishop of Chartres John of Salisbury. John's *Policraticus* is much more overtly a political thesis than *On the Goodness of Peace*, but both devote themselves to the conflation of moral and civic virtues within earthly government as represented by the commonwealth. For John, the commonwealth can be understood by means of the "microcosm," a body dependent for its harmony on the coordination between head and members.[96] Rufinus, more Augustinian in his approach, makes the human self his starting point; but while arguing that the self can serve as a pattern for society, he also accounts for the impact of society on the self. Discord and resolution between spirit and flesh are more than metaphors for politics and governance: they are their source and coextension. But Rufinus departs from a binary approach to sociopolitical and moral thought (Augustine's two cities) and instead plays with ternarity, threefold conditions, an intellectual development that the historian Jacques Le Goff has also noticed in the spatial conceptualization of purgatory around 1200.[97]

Although it might be dangerous to overly contextualize a treatise indebted to the Augustinian tradition, *On the Goodness of Peace* should also be read as the intellectual product of regular warfare between imperial and papal

95. See the discussion of Carolingian dualism in Karl Morrison, *The Two Kingdoms: Ecclesiology in Carolingian Political Thought* (Princeton, NJ, 1964), 118–125.

96. John of Salisbury, *Policraticus sive de nugiis curalium et vestigiis philosophorum* 4.1, PL 199:513C. For the English translation, see *Policraticus: Of the Frivolities of Courtiers and the Footprints of Philosophers*, trans. Cary J. Nederman (Cambridge, 1990), 4.1, 28.

97. Jacques Le Goff, *The Birth of Purgatory*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Chicago, 1984; Fr. orig. 1981).

supporters, across and within Italian cities. Rufinus's peace is a moral and spiritual condition here spoken of in terms of pacts, confederations, and battles. This vocabulary was not new for the twelfth century. As seen in previous chapters, the moral speculations of Anselm of Laon and later of Aelred of Rievaulx describe the human condition as conflict poised between two almost unattainable states of absolute peace, where peacemaking most appropriately comes in the form of violent shocks to a torpid system.[98] Theology that made peace indispensable to sacramental efficacy also posited two armies, blessed and diabolical, identified by their sacramental bonds of peace.[99] These visions of peace came to French schoolmen and English monks, who (despite my arguments to contrary) may have had only a tangential connection to the political ferment of their cities; Bishop Rufinus, legate at Lateran III and canon lawyer, can claim no such isolation. And in *On the Goodness of Peace*, he brings the theological speculations of the doctors of Laon, Liège, and Paris to bear on the immediate problem of Christian government over a world whose very essence is war.

Citing Pseudo-Dionysius and Augustine, Rufinus argues that no creature can deny itself some version of peace. In this sense as well as in the sense that it is a mystery, peace is a sacrament: the name PAX stands for the trinity of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; it is at the same time singularity and perfectly harmonious plurality.[100] A sacrament in Augustinian terms is a sacred sign: figuration of divine form. It is also a bond that joins people to one another and to God. Peace shares all these qualities with the sacrament, and like the sacrament, it is prone to imitation, parody and misuse. The wicked consume peace as they do a sacrament, concentrating on its superficies, misunderstanding its essence, and thus unable to digest it or be nourished by it. Therefore, despite the fact that every creature desires peace, few receive it fully, while the rest are left with the "rude and undigestible" portion.[101]

Peace manifested itself on earth under eight different species: God's peace; his peace with humanity; the devil's peace; his peace with humanity; the angels' peace; their peace with humanity; personal, human peace; a person's peace with the rest of humanity. Substitutions of the appropriate peace generated the postlapsarian world. The universe was initially distorted, Rufinus claimed, when Lucifer ruptured the peace of angels, creating a rebel

98. See above, chapter 5.

99. See above, chapter 4.

100. *DBP* 1.1, 52; 1.2, 56.

101. *DBP* 1.2, 58: "rudem hanc et indigestam pacis materiam."

confederation against God. The fall of humanity echoed this perversion, when Adam through disobedience gave up peace with God by making a pact with the devil and joining his rebel league.[102] Embraced by the devil's peace, man did nothing: if he had resisted, he might have freed himself, because the devil is timid and weak.[103] But human nature is too depraved to save itself. Humanity instead slept the "sleep of Behemoth, who rests in the shade and in the moist places," insensible to its own imprisonment.[104]

Thus far, Rufinus follows Augustine's description of the great human tragedy: man is free but allows himself to be imprisoned through a covenant with hell; he is denied glorification not by the devil's war but by his own peace. By sending Christ as a mediator (through assumption of human flesh) and reconciler (through his inauguration of the New Testament), the Father had of his own accord freed humanity from the diabolical pact and offered a new peace that was better because it extended not only to the tribes of Israel but to everybody.[105] The new peace was a war pact similar to the Old Testament covenant with Israel, one that doubled the strength of those who would accept it and switch sides.[106] Despite all this, many persons continued in their torpor: given permission and strength to secede from the diabolical confederation, they still remained inert, thinking that this inertia was the peace they should possess.

It was essential, therefore, for human beings to *recognize* an appropriate peace and reject poor substitutes—but how did one do that on this violent earth? The bulk of Rufinus's treatise concerns the peace that human beings should pursue with one another, since humanity experiences peace as modules of divine, diabolical, or angelic peace. He departs from the binary model of blessed and wicked peace used by his predecessors and introduces a third species: the peace of the merely good (*pax bonorum*).[107] The interpersonal bonds of blessed, wicked, and merely good peace inform respectively the peace of Jerusalem, of Egypt, and of Babylon.[108] Rufinus makes the turbulent

102. *DBP* 1.8–9, 74–78.

103. *DBP* 1.7, 72.

104. *DBP* 1.8, 76: "requies est et sompnus Behemot, quo sub umbra dormit in secreto calami in locis humectibus."

105. *DBP* 1.4, 64.

106. *DBP* 1.6, 70.

107. *DBP* 1.12, 84.

108. *DBP* 2.1, 102.

median condition of Babylon the only peace applicable to an earthly commonwealth.

Like the French schoolmen who wrote before him, Rufinus argued that to maintain any kind of peace with God, human beings must remain implacable to false peace. Though seductive, its binding signs conveyed lies: the kiss of a wicked peace came as if from a harlot's lips.[109] Educated taste and sustained hostility were the only answers. Egypt's mimic peace, mediated by Satan, reversed Paul's description of the church as concordant head and members: its participants "stuck together like scales," stubborn and unthinking, joined by misdirected love.[110] Often used as a fantasy of communal and heretical conspiracy, this image also recalls Isidore of Seville's distinction between *ecclesia* and *synagoga*: the bonds of *synagoga* are inauthentic, lacking sensibility.[111] Against this glutinous and torpid peace the only recourse was the sword that Christ brought on earth, with Christian soldiers enacting divine anger.[112]

Rufinus's wicked peace resembles John of Salisbury's description of tyranny in *Policraticus*. The state under the tyrant Caesar was a commonwealth defined by the languor and indiscipline of subjects. Their lethargy indicted the monarch, demonstrating that when a ruler chose to be tyrant rather than prince, he became a disease in the body politic.[113] In the microcosm of the state, an illegitimate head produced corruption and paralysis, and the system's internal perversion turned the use of state force into violence. By contrast, under the "peaceful will of law" a ruler may shed blood by the sword yet not be a man of blood. When he received it from the church's hands, even the ruler's military sword became the "sword of the dove," which slaughters without wrath or personal animosity.[114]

In *On the Goodness of Peace*, too, there is provision for use of the sword in peace, but it is limited to only one of two just regimes. The sword is alien to the peace of Jerusalem, which is conciliated by the Father as a state of

109. *DBP* 1.13, 86–88. Cf. Prov. 5.1.

110. *DBP* 2.5, 108. Cf. Job 41.6.

111. Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiarum sive originum* 8.1–8, ed. W. M. Lindsay (Oxford, 1911), on *ecclesia* and *synagoga*. Note, above, that in his life of Alexander, Boso uses "synagoge" for the schismatics who confederated with Emperor Frederick against the pope. Boso, *Vita Alexandri*, 442, 447.

112. Rufinus quotes Isa. 19.2–3: "I will set the Egyptians against the Egyptians: and they shall fight each against his brother; each against his neighbor; city against city; and the spirit of Egypt that is among them shall be destroyed." *DBP* 2.7, 112. The reader is left to supply the rest of the biblical verse: "and a fierce king shall rule over them."

113. *Policraticus* 3.10, 496B-C.

114. *Policraticus* 4.2–3, 515C-516A.

absolute concord and instilled in the human heart through wisdom. Like Bruno of Segni before him, Rufinus reads this moral peace into Jesus's words "Have salt among you and have peace between you," and interprets salt as the "condiment [i.e., conjoining element] of wisdom."[115] The church as a body should aspire to this peace, but Jerusalem cannot be perfected while on earth; it is for persons, not institutions, for it can brook no hatred or enmity.[116] However, it *is* possible to perfect on earth a kingdom under just peace, where "just" refers to an Aristotelian "natural justice." The Peace of Babylon relies on equity, as if the world were a single household, held together by quasi-familial bonds and ruled by a patriarchal figure. Bound by natural justice, all people are subject to this peace by virtue of their common humanity. Its expression on earth is the city, and this civic peace prudently balances fundamental and superficial necessities so that charity may exist in harmony with wealth, politics, and warfare, without the one constituting a violation of the other.[117]

Despite its reliance on Augustine, *On the Goodness of Peace* was no warmed-over *City of God* but a retailoring of the bishop of Hippo's political realism. By means of the Peace of Babylon, Rufinus gave a religious imperative to the quotidian interactions of a high medieval world that had expanded territorially, politically, and commercially. He argued that a commonwealth (*respublica*) was the only regime that *could* be fully realized, and only as nested modules of decent peace. Most intimately, Babylonian peace ensured the authority of the householder and the steadfastness of domestic relationships, which translated at the level of the city to peace in the public square and religious places, and respect for particular laws and customs. At the most general level, that of "the orb," civic and domestic peace became the community of kingdoms and regions, facilitated by travelers and by the commercial instruments, markets, and languages that connected them. A mundane peace that resulted from the coming together of humanity, Babylon ensured that multiple groups of persons had to communicate with one another or descend into barbarism. At any of its levels, the regime of peace could persist only through a tacit pact between ruler and subject that guaranteed mutual respect and an ordering of roles.[118] With its allowance for a multiplicity of stations of life, the Peace

115. *DBP* 2.19, 146. Cf. Bruno of Segni, *Commentaria in Matthaeum*, *PL* 165:101A; and see above, chapter 6.

116. *DBP* 2.23, 158.

117. *DBP* 2.8–10, 114–126.

118. *DBP* 2.9, 120–124.

of Babylon helped break down the Three Orders of war, prayer, and labor, a Carolingian social imagining that had resisted another envisioning of peace, the millennial Peace of God movement.[119]

This mutual recognition under natural justice meant that the commonwealth, Babylonian peace, was truly universal. Rufinus uses two Old Testament examplars to illustrate this broad offer of peace, Moses and Jacob:[120]

> If such peace should not be made with infidels, then why does the lord say through Moses in Deuteronomy: If you go to expunge the city, first offer them peace . . . ? And, insofar as this peace *is* to be had with infidels, we have read that for its sake [benefit] the holy Jacob sent gifts to his brother.

The encompassing peace included one's own people and foreigners, and faithful and infidel alike, with only a few exceptions. Against the diseased, habitual criminals (*persequentes*, also persecutors) and rebels, preservers of the Peace of Babylon must wage war. These persons offended not by sinning but by constructing alternate regimes of tyranny, fraud, and bloodshed. Criminals undermined the civil concord and offended public decency through misdeeds, while rebels scorned legitimate domination by usurping public offices.[121] By "diseased," Rufinus refers to sociopaths and heretics, persons who would raise up a confederation of Egypt (i.e., of vices) in the midst of the Peace of Babylon. Such a confederation produced both a moral and a political rupture. Babylon's peace was therefore a concord signed in the blood of the reprobate.[122] Those marked for destruction included insiders and outsiders, who were reviled not on account of their faith but for their antagonism to civic virtue.

The enemies of peace were enemies of the sociopolitical body, of the "decorum" of authority and obedience. Rufinus's proscription of them mirrors

---

119. Dominique Iogna-Prat, "Le 'baptême' du schéma des trois ordres fonctionnels: L'apport de l'école d'Auxerre dans la seconde moitié du IXe siècle," *Annales E.S.C.* 41.1 (1986): 43–61, ascribes the Three Orders formulation to Héric of Auxerre during the reign of Charles the Bald. On the breakdown of the Three Orders distinction under the new *statuus vitae*, see André Vauchez, *The Laity in the Middle Ages: Religious Beliefs and Devotional Practices*, trans. Daniel E. Bornstein (Notre Dame, IN, 1993; Fr. orig. 1987), 103.

120. *DBP* 2.12, 126–128: "Si pax ista coli cum infidelibus non deberet, dominus in Deuteronomio per Moysen quare diceret: *Si iveris ad expugnandam civitatem, offeres ei primum pacem* . . . ? In tantum autem pax hec cum infidelibus habenda est, ut pro bono eius sanctum Iacob munera fratri misisse legerimus" (emphasis added).

121. *DBP* 2.12, 130.

122. *DBP* 2.12, 128. Cf. Deut. 7.1–4.

attempts among churchmen to imagine themselves not as exiles from God's kingdom but as subjects of worldly dominion. The incitement of Egypt against Babylon is an image taken from the Old Testament visions of Ezekiel, who saw Jerusalem destroyed because its king Zedekiah had rescinded his pact with the gentile king Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon and confected an alliance with the pharaoh. God then blinded Zedekiah to emphasize that a bond of subjection must not be broken even if the prince is harsh or pagan. During the Investiture Controversy, when the reforming pope Gregory VII justified rebellion against imperial authority by asserting that the church was in Babylonian captivity, his opponents pointed to the vision of Ezekiel to argue that while still on earth, Jerusalem, the ideal church, must subject itself to imperfect, temporal dominion.[123] By naming acceptable peace after Nebuchadnezzar's dominion, Rufinus allowed churchmen to accommodate secular rulership without the burden of entrapment.

Given the looming threat of Barbarossa to Rufinus's friends in the papacy, this embrace of temporal dominion may seem incongruous, even dangerous. However, by framing Babylon as he did, Rufinus was denying the emperor the Jerusalem he wanted, and thus consigning him to the place of any other earthly monarch. The difference between the Peace of Babylon and that of Jerusalem marked the distance between the *administratio* (executive function) of the emperor and the greater *auctoritas* (authority) of the pope. The canonist Rufinus provides a detailed description of the distinctions between *administratio* and *auctoritas* in his *Summa decretorum*.[124] In accordance with these distinctions, in *On the Goodness of Peace*, Rufinus assigned a higher dignity to the Peace of Jerusalem, while giving the Peace of Babylon primacy of operation. Mundane, civic peace promoted the joy and security through which blessed peace was conveyed.[125] While on earth, the pope deferred to the emperor insofar as they were *both* administrators of Babylon; but because the emperor lacked authority over moral Jerusalem, he could never presume to *judge* the pope.

While dampening imperial ambitions through the separation of peaceful spheres, Rufinus had placed the church in a precarious position, administering one city while ruling another. Given its signifying institutions, oaths, pacts, and greetings, the peace of the church was in fact a mundane peace,

123. See above, chapter 2.

124. Robinson, *Papacy*, 300. Cf. *Policraticus* 4.3, 32. John of Salisbury makes the similar point that the emperor is a "minister" to the clergy.

125. *DBP* 2.23, 158.

the Peace of Babylon. The mundane peace even began in the church, not in the world: the kiss of peace, a binding signature of concord in treaties and contracts was only a derivation of the kiss first delivered by the priest at Mass.[126] Yet the clerical keepers of a mundane peace could not enjoy Jerusalem's perfect and forgiving peace, since they must remain implacable against violators of public concord.

While they were not encouraged to kill, clerical peacekeepers had a duty to cast out those who remained incorrigible under the Peace of Babylon. Both clerical and lay peacekeepers must constantly pursue deviants, who should be embraced only in the heavenly city. The church was at once shepherd's flock and king's army, an army whose coordination delighted angels and terrified demons. It enjoyed a militant peace where unity of faith, concord of will, and conformity of customs demanded human, communitarian practices of domination and restraint.[127] The wicked were included in this peace as a challenge and stepping stone. Rufinus cites an Old Testament model for this turbulent and implacable peacemaking: when the herdsmen of Gerara quarreled with Isaac over the wells that his shepherds had dug, Isaac named the first well Calumny and the second well Enmities but named the third well, which was uncontested, Latitude. In this way, through progressive discords, the Israelites were able to come into a promised land and to discover what God had provided for them.[128] For Rufinus, this event showed how discord, correction, and exclusion could bring the goodness of peace to everyone.[129]

Despite its roots in the moral speculations of early twelfth-century theologians, the Peace of Babylon did not stand for the resolution of a conflict between good and evil, or between reason and carnality. It also avoided models of salvation history that saw in everyday conflicts the road signs to the Apocalypse. Rufinus was trying to stop the clock, stretch out the intervening age, and tame history back into an Augustinian mode of faithful expectation. Monarchical authority must remain content that present discords and reprisals were only the Peace of Babylon; to imagine them as more was to be deceived by false peace. Rufinus's *On the Goodness of Peace* provides the

126. *DBP* 2.27–28, 172–174.

127. See *DBP* 2.30, 182–184. Rufinus describes why the peace of the church cannot be perfect in the present.

128. *DbP* 2.18, 144. Gen. 26.20.

129. *DbP* 2.18, 144: "Ex contrariorum ergo effectibus quantum sit huius pacis bonum iam clarius videmus." (Out of the effects of things to the contrary, we may now see more clearly how much is the goodness of this peace.)

theological corollary to Pope Alexander III's fastidious attitude toward a peace that promised too much or came too fast, suspicions of peace that had long been in the making.

Theologies of peace evolved in tandem with political struggles and the expansion of civic institutions. The conflict between Frederick and Alexander drew in Christian kingdoms and social groups as the Investiture Controversy had not. A refined vocabulary gave peacemakers a monopoly on moral redemption, social bonds, evangelism, and government. And while the traditional powers of empire and papacy continued to struggle for the mandate of peace, they also conferred the mandate on their allies, legitimizing new forms of government, like the communes. As proponents of enhanced pastoral activity had already accepted, changes in the outside world left their imprint on the altar.

Papal policy at the end of the twelfth century reflects Rufinus's interest in maintaining the Peace of Babylon as an instrument toward the yet unattainable Peace of Jerusalem. Because Babylon was a civic peace that had a religious function, enemies of the social order must be considered reprobate under religious law. Heretics became both a social and a spiritual threat because they constituted an Egyptian insurrection against Babylon's peace. Churchmen, claiming to be primary keepers of the peace, acknowledged that their peacemaking applied to earth as much as heaven, and that the pursuit of heretics was one of several wars against enemies of peace. The canons of the Third and especially the Fourth Lateran Council make provisions for this conflict. Innocent III instituted the Franciscan order as an "army," whose members during the early thirteenth century went from city to city, upholding municipal peace in cooperation with local bishops and the commune.[130] In turn, the commune produced evangelists, notably the merchant Homobonus of Cremona, whom Innocent canonized in 1199 for his part in the war on heresies; as the bull specified, it was a war of peacemaking and reform.[131] Around 1240, Albertanus of Brescia echoed Rufinus's Peace of

130. For a complete treatment of Franciscan peacemaking, see Augustine Thompson, *Revival Preachers and Politics in Thirteenth-Century Italy: The Great Devotion of 1233* (Oxford, 1992). Expressive of the numerous avenues available to scholars of Franciscan engagement with urban lay communities is the volume of essays *Économie et religion: L'expérience des ordres mendiants (XIIIe-XVe siècle)*, ed. Nicole Bériou and Jacques Chiffoleau (Lyon, 2009).

131. André Vauchez, "La paix dans les mouvements religieux populaires (XIe-XVe siècle)," in *Pace e guerra nel Basso Medioevo: Atti del XL Convegno storico internazionale Todi, 12–14 ottobre 2003* (Spoleto, 2004), 318–319; and Vauchez, *Laity in the Middle Ages*, 64ff.

Babylon when he wrote that human actions became secular and sacred only on the basis of their ultimate concerns; in any civil society these activities were complementary.[132] Albertanus also argued that violence could be solved only when churchmen embraced their secular responsibilities.

The conjunction of spiritual and temporal endeavor also produced troubling challenges to clerical exceptionalism. Late twelfth-century churchmen often resisted lay evangelical movements, going so far as to anathematize Waldensian and Humiliati preachers as heretics. Not simply a demand for obedience from lay spiritual movements, these anathemas expressed concerns about blurred boundaries between clerical and lay activity. The Peace of Babylon had given clerics permission to administer the earthly commonwealth, but such a messy peacekeeping enterprise ultimately undermined their *auctoritas*. As early as the thirteenth century, clerics were actually being excluded from the peace that they had helped to imagine, and even denied the status of *cives*.[133] I will touch on this unforeseen yet irresistible outcome of visualizing peace in the epilogue to this book.

---

132. James M. Powell, *Albertanus of Brescia: The Pursuit of Happiness in the Early Thirteenth Century* (Philadelphia, 1992), 75.

133. Jones, *Italian City-State*, 425 and 432.

Epilogue

> In the quietude and tranquility of peace, humanity attains most freely and easily to its proper function, which is almost divine.

So wrote Dante Alighieri in his controversial *De monarchia* of 1318, deemed heretical by Pope John XXII and preserved only through camouflage.[1] Refuted by proxy, mistitled, bound within unrelated manuscripts, the authorized edition only emerged in Protestant Basel in the middle of the sixteenth century.[2] Written as the pope debated radical Franciscans over ecclesiastical property and asserted his sovereign right to rule in the absence of an emperor, *De monarchia* argues for clerical obedience to secular powers. Echoing the late twelfth-century canonist Huguccio of Pisa, Dante claimed that temporal principalities were divinely instituted, that the empire preceded the papacy, and that the monarch was sovereign in all affairs of the world.[3] He predicated

1. Dante Alighieri, *De monarchia* 1.4, ed. E. Moore (Oxford, 1916), 343: "patet quod genus humanum in quiete sive tranquillitate pacis ad proprium suum opus, quod fere divinum est . . . liberrime atque facillime se habet."

2. Anthony Cassell, *The Monarchia Controversy* (Washington, DC, 2004), 41–43.

3. For Huguccio's part in fourteenth-century discussions of sovereignty and jurisdiction, especially his elaboration on Rufinus, see Francesco Maiolo, *Medieval Sovereignty: Marsilius of Padua and Bartholomew of Saxoferrato* (Delft, 2007), 149.

these arguments on the axiom that humanity's greatest benefit was to live in peace, a state that he equated with tranquility and harmony. This peace could be achieved only if society were ordered under a single, principal authority that ruled exceptionally, a ruler in whom justice could be maximized through the power of charity and the divine gift of human will exercised most freely.[4] Taking its motion from the prime movement of this single ruler, or mono-arch, humanity could attain to the semblance of God, the function toward which it had been designed.

Dante noted that Christian history conveyed this message of peace. A moment of perfect and universal tranquility, the singular rule of Augustus had inaugurated the age of the Son.[5] On the other hand, Constantine's donation of the West to the papacy, a violation of his imperial office, had rendered the world open to conflict, chaos, and disunity.[6] By inference, then, monarchy and peace were one: the essential condition for obtaining the best of humanity.

Dante identified the fundamental needs of humanity in the same terms as reformers of the church had in the late eleventh century: peace and liberty, the two inseparable from each other. However, for him only earthly government could secure these benefits. The peace of which Dante spoke was a singularity of dominion that subjected persons, communities, and kingdoms according to a hierarchy of who should serve and who should govern—not an absorption within a body at peace but rather a dispersal of peacemaking momentum from its prime cause, the monarch, to the rest of the world. If the terms had been changed, Pope Gregory VII might not have disagreed with these ambitions for peace, nor might pontiffs like Innocent III or Boniface VIII, who had insisted on papal sovereignty as an antidote to the church's worldly captivity. But the impossible vision of peace that had ignited Gregory's reform had long ceded to an accommodation with secular government; pope and emperor could be assigned an equal divine ordination only because they could also be assigned an equivalent temporality.

---

4. Dante, *Monarchia* 1.4–8, 343–345.

5. Dante, *Monarchia* 1.11, 345. Like clerics who rejoiced at treaties between towns and proclamations of the Truce of God, Dante also uses Vergil's pastoral to signal the cessation of hostilities, but he links it directly to the age of Augustus, in which the poet wrote. A likely influence here is Origen's *Contra Celsum*. See a discussion of Origen's association between the moment of Christ's birth and the culmination of the *Pax Romana* under Augustus in Gerard Caspary, *Politics and Exegesis: Origen and the Two Swords* (Berkeley, 1979), 131–132 and 138.

6. Dante, *Monarchia* 3.10: 370–372. Note that the Donation of Constantine has long been exposed as a forgery. In fact, Renaissance humanists, the heirs of Dante, played an important role in its exposure.

In *Monarchia*, Dante dismissed the papal argument that the two swords that Peter found in the garden of Gethsemane conferred any governing power on the apostle or his successors.[7] Instead, God had bestowed a sword on the temporal prince, not via any apostolic mediation but through the incontrovertible desire of human nature for justice. This earthly government, upheld by humanity's natural inclination toward justice, corresponded to Rufinus of Sorrento's Peace of Babylon. But in *Monarchia* and in the work of Dante's contemporary Marsilius of Padua, such peace came wearing an iron crown.

The impact of peace theology on the legitimation of secular government lies beyond the scope of this book, taking us as it does from the thirteenth to the sixteenth century. Nonetheless, I will close with a glance at the age of Dante, and especially at the part played by conceptions of peace in the political theory of Marsilius. In *Defender of the Peace* (1324) Marsilius refuted the legitimacy of papal government in terms all too familiar: assignation of a monopoly over peace. The most ardent of imperialists, Marsilius refused the papacy a part in government by denying its ability to maintain peace on earth.

Educated in canon law and medicine, and heavily influenced by Aristotelian political theory, Marsilius also used authorities familiar to twelfth-century political theorists and theologians of papal sovereignty: Augustine, Ambrose, and the *Ordinary Gloss*. But while twelfth-century theologies presented peace as a variety of alternatives to mere tranquility, for Marsilius tranquility and peace were equivalent. Like Dante, Marsilius relied on Aristotle's *Politics* for his argument that the end (and thus final cause) of government was peace, since only in peace could humanity achieve its greatest potential, and only in tranquility could the various components of the state function in the most coordinated and effective manner.[8] The maintenance of peace required a singularity of purpose from each component, so that all offices, priestly and military, were subordinated to the singular office of the ruler. To defend tranquility, temporal dominion must employ coercion. Meanwhile, the ordering of the eternal kingdom must rely on virtue and faith, albeit in a manner that obviated conflict and competition.[9]

---

7. Dante, *Monarchia* 3.9: 369–370.

8. Marsilius of Padua, *Defensor pacis* 1.19.2, ed. C. W. Previté-Orton (Cambridge, 1928), 100: "Erat enim tranquillitas bona dispositio civitatis seu regni, qua potest unaquaeque suarum partium facere opera convenientia sibi secundum rationem et suam institutionem."

9. As opposed to human law, which must be prosecuted on earth by coercive means, divine law could be treated as a coercive precept only as it pertained to the next world and punishments therein. *Defensor* 2.9.1–4, 186–190. See also Marsilius of Padua, *Defensor Minor* 13.2, ed. Cary J. Nederman (Cambridge, 1993), 44–45.

Marsilius noted that Aristotle could never have imagined the extraordinary danger to tranquility posed by the Roman papacy, which had construed its preeminence among churches to be divinely conferred rather than an office deriving from the state.[10] On the strength of his succession from the apostle Peter and a misreading of the Donation of Constantine, the bishop of Rome claimed not only primacy over other priests but also a "plenitude of power" that gave him "coercive jurisdiction" over all human beings. Marsilius alluded to Boniface's bull *Unam Sanctam* as the culmination of this claim, particularly an argument that the pope had taken from Hugh of Saint-Victor's *De sacramentis*: that every creature was constituted by and must be subject to the spiritual authority, as flesh was to spirit.[11]

The popes asserted their claims of temporal governance "under the appearance (*species*) of seeking peace among Christ's faithful."[12] Instead, this wrongheaded desire had become a "disease" that Marsilius saw infecting all Christian states and opposing all "quietude and welfare."[13] Even though Christ had refused earthly dominion for himself or his apostles, ambitious popes had slowly usurped secular prerogatives of coercion by first bullying disunited Italians and then gradually taking on stronger kings. While they still fought shy of asserting their claim over all powers (one imagines Marsilius was thinking of the Mongols and Turks), the popes had targeted the Roman emperor and the territories under him, taking advantage of a vacancy in imperial office after the death of Henry VII to assert their own sovereignty. In the bargain, they had prevented the next, duly elected emperor, Ludwig of Bavaria, from being instituted, from deriving the full quotient of coercive force vouchsafed his office, and from functioning as the just regulator of civil society, that is, as the preserver of peace. Italian polities had fallen out with one another, and in the absence of a single standard, a yardstick for civil conduct, fights had broken out, and people had become alienated.[14]

Marsilius considered exposure of clerical incursion to be his own defense of peace, one that should be imitated by all those who wished to avoid being party to injuring Christian governments. The clergy had been given certain authority by an earthly government, the ambit of which extended only to spiritual benefit, and judgment in the sense of evaluation and correction.

10. *Defensor* 1.19.3–6, 101–104.
11. *Defensor* 1.19.9–10, 105–106.
12. *Defensor* 1.19.11, 106–107.
13. *Defensor* 1.19.13, 109.
14. *Defensor* 1.19.11, 107.

It did not even extend to the coercion of emotional states, because, as he pointed out, these ultimately pertained to human action, and to the impact of human beings on one another. Even as far as spiritual benefit went, priests were gatekeepers of salvation, not judges in the sovereign sense of the term. They had in fact no coercive authority, but merely the mandate to express coercive divine judgment through performance or withholding of the sacrament.[15] Moreover, when clergy attempted to judge any human action or even human passions, they intruded on temporal matters. Christ had denied himself and his followers the power to judge such activities, relinquishing them to temporal rulers, who should be given due obedience.[16] Clerics had misappropriated the term "spiritual" to refer to their concerns and actions, when these had an impact on the worldly living of others, and so must be subject to the sovereign judgment of human law. Even priests who transgressed through lust, concupiscence, or vainglory were subject to civil authorities; in fact, given their position as exemplars and their knowledge of right and wrong, defaulting priests were even more liable.[17]

No matter the ruler, it was the tranquility of the state that ensured earthly order. Marsilius insisted that peace and tranquility could come only from the appropriate and unobstructed activity of the secular ruler over both clergy and laity. He accused the popes of furthering their secular ambitions through the pretense of peacemaking, and with a mixture of sophistic arguments and threats of excommunication.[18] The specter of false peace, so long a mandate for clerical supervision, had been turned around and brought to bear on clerical aspirations over society and politics. True peace was the sole prerogative of the secular monarch, manifested as social tranquility, a condition in which human being, household, and state could perform their most appropriate functions in accordance with the dictates of reason. Clerical ambitions of governance, over clergy or laity, posed a danger to this peace.

In a protracted debate over the sovereignty of the universal powers and the exact meaning of their jurisdiction, Marsilius's contribution is only one among several. And yet he is peculiarly positioned in promising much to scholars of modern secular theory while adhering faithfully to a venerable

15. See *Defensor* 2.1.4–5, 113–115; 2.4.6, 132–133 and 2.6.1–14, 159–174, following Peter Lombard, who develops Gregory the Great's image of the risen Lazarus to explain the binding and loosing power of priests; in Lombard's exegesis (*Sententiae* 4.18), Christ's disciples simply loosened Lazarus's shroud after their master had revived him.

16. *Defensor* 2.4.2–13, 129–143.

17. *Defensor* 2.8.8, 183.

18. *Defensor* 1.19.11, 106–107.

model of imperial peace. Marsilius was not a secularist but a Ghibelline, who encouraged Ludwig IV to invade Rome in 1326 and even became "people's delegate" and "spiritual vicar" of the Roman church before the citizens got tired of the imperial party.[19] His Aristotelian conception of a tranquil state mirrors medieval understandings of peace as first and foremost the absence of conflict, within which humanity can achieve the maximum soteriological benefit. And it refutes the experimentation with a turbulent peace that monastic, papal, and "protoscholastic" reformers had been conducting since the early eleventh century. Most of all, the propositions of Marsilius, Dante, and several other commentators on papal jurisdiction determined that clerical participation in a civic peace made clergy both subject to the temporal powers and susceptible to criticisms of worldliness and corruption. By these charges, critics reproved papal ambitions in vocabulary that carried the utmost weight and conveyed historically embedded fears. When Jan Hus wrote that all clerical preoccupation with temporalities constituted simony, he went to the heart of medieval anxieties about peace on earth.[20]

It is a sobering thought that a peace too universal and exacting is not only unrealistic but dangerous, that in fact the particularistic chimeras and tentative harmonies that medieval clergy so dreaded are not falsifications of peace but rather the corrective to impossible visions. These visions were not restricted to one or another party in a papal-imperial contest that was protracted, complicated, and unfeasible to break down along binary divisions. A claim of peacemaking can lay the peacemaker open to greater scrutiny and suspicion than the antagonists he or she hopes to pacify.[21] Eleventh- and twelfth-century emperors as much as popes were guilty of expecting too much, of imposing visions of authority and obedience that they considered traditional but that must have been puzzling and problematic to cities and communities that set great store by autonomy well in advance of juridical devices like the commune. Witness Milan's energetic defense of its autocratic archbishop against Conrad II in 1026 or the Lombard resistance to Barbarossa

19. See Alan Gewirth, *Marsilius of Padua, the Defender of Peace,* vol. 1: *Marsilius of Padua and Medieval Political Philosophy* (New York, 1951), 21–22; but also George Garnett, *Marsilius of Padua and "the Truth of History"* (Oxford, 2006), who resists attempts to present Marsilius as either a precursor of "modern," secularist thought or a purveyor of republicanism (1–14) and sees him instead as an exponent of providential history.

20. The translation from the vernacular is Jan Hus, "On Simony," in *Advocates of Reform*, ed. and trans. Matthew Spinka (Philadelphia, 1953), 196–278.

21. At the time of writing, President Hugo Chavez of Venezuela had just offered to mediate between Muammar Gaddafi and the Libyans who opposed his rule; in the Western media the offer was seen simply as an attempt by Chavez to secure his own standing in the international community.

that culminated in victory at the Peace of Constance in 1183.[22] As Gregory the Great had warned, citing Ezekiel, exiles in Babylon must not pursue Jerusalem before its time. The towers and sieges that arrayed themselves before the horrified gaze of medieval peacemakers should have informed them that their demand for the celestial city was not peace but invasion.

It has long been obvious to historians of high medieval ecclesiastical and social reform that clerically trained scholars and polemicists worked on many sides of the debate over the church's oversight of lay community, temporal dominion, and even religious praxis. Those who opposed Gregory VII and his successors cannot be thought of as traditionalists or even imperial stooges. They too were rethinking peace and the extent to which an earthly church could aspire to a monolithic and implacable vision of it. Even popes determined the journey to celestial Jerusalem to be too far and too discordant, and militarized missions of conversion that invoked the name of peace received their share of suspicion and even derision. At the same time, we should recognize the extent to which the clergy modeled their own peacemaking on social practice and performance sometimes erroneously attributed to the laity alone. A glance at the itinerary of evangelists in Lombardy, Flanders, or Pomerania shows how peacemaking and conversion worked in tandem, not just as moral metaphors but as guidelines to process, representation, and the maintenance of relationships between the "little souls" and Christ. The emotional transformations demanded of conversion could be called up in accounts of aggressive confrontation, anger and even madness, passions sublimated into tears of love and professions of peace. But did these criteria for spiritual conversion translate as easily to temporal dominion: *was* it in fact possible for faith and fidelity to be authenticated by the same sacraments?

Late medieval political thinkers suggest not: against the multiple emotional and moral valences of individual rulers and subjects stands the unmoved Leviathan of government itself, scale joined to scale, concerned not with the ultimate but with the immediate, the possible, and the legal. It must be this way, argues Marsilius: the office of the monarch must have the full prerogative of coercion because it embodies law, whereas the prince who occupies this office should possess more subjective qualities, such as a sense of equity that will allow him to function in areas outside the ambit of the law.[23] The prince may thus express the natural inclination of humanity for a beneficial and tranquil life, however achieved—an inclination that Aristotle describes

22. See above, chapters 3 and 8 respectively.

23. See *Defensor* 1.14.1–10, 61–66.

as natural justice and Augustine sees in the desire of all creatures for some version of peace. In the absolutist theory of Bodin and Hobbes, the friendships and attachments of human beings no longer appear problematic if these fragments of peace are accepted as enough and the rest left to abstract government, whose concern is not to save but to ensure tranquility. Wars fought with tranquility as their goal are conducted so as to facilitate a continuing relationship after hostilities, not to annihilate the enemy or transform their *mores*. Like all theory, this too has proved unrealizable, for it does not take into account that ideas once broached have their own momentum and habits of practice evolve to survive. Suspicions of false peace follow us today, evidenced by a jealous state that appears to demand boundless affection instead of simple ratification, where political ritual and international conflict serve visions of universal, eschatological liberation somewhere beyond Jerusalem.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Manuscripts Consulted

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France

Fonds latins

529. Guibert of Nogent, *Moralia in Genesim*, Book 1. Twelfth century.
624. Geoffrey Babion (attributed), *Enarrationes in Matthaeum*. Beaupré, twelfth century.
1252. Isaac of Stella, *De sacramento altaris*. Late twelfth century.
2702. Collection, containing patristic letters, medical texts, sermons of Geoffrey Babion and others. Twelfth century (1167).
2839. Florilegium, containing sermons of Geoffrey Babion and Bernard of Clairvaux. Likely Cistercian, twelfth century.
3479. Confessors' manual, including sermons of Geoffrey Babion. Late thirteenth century.
3482. Alger of Liège, *De sacramentis corporis et sanguinis dominici*. Thérouanne, twelfth century.
3810. Homiliary, containing sermons of Geoffrey Babion; verses of Hildebert of Lavardin. Late twelfth century.
12999. Anselm of Laon, *Ex dictis patris*. Florilegium of Saint-Amand. Twelfth century.
13932. Abbey of Lobbes, Collected Chronicles. Tournai, sixteenth century.
14926. Hugh of Saint-Victor, "Sur Genesim." Abbey of Saint-Victor, Paris, thirteenth century.
18108. Florilegium. Twelfth century.

Nouvelles acquisitions latines

2245. Bible with gloss: Genesis and Exodus. Cluny, thirteenth century.

Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal

143. Bible with gloss: Gospel of Matthew. Late twelfth century.
403. Tracts for preachers. Abbey of Saint-Victor, Paris, late thirteenth century.

Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine

87. Bible with gloss: Book of Job. Thirteenth century.

563. Collection, containing letter from Anselm of Laon to abbot of Saint-Laurence of Liège. Twelfth century.
718. Hugh of Saint-Victor, *De sacramentis*. Estimated thirteenth century.

MANUSCRIPTS ON MICROFICHE AT L'INSTITUT DE RECHERCHE ET D'HISTOIRE DES TEXTES (IRHT)

Arras, Bibliothèque Municipale

626. Anselm of Laon (attributed), *Enarrationes in Matthaeum* [Microfiche 58701].

Troyes, Bibliothèque Municipale

934. Bible with gloss: Apocalypse [Microfiche 31118].

Valenciennes, Bibliothèque Municipale

0019(13). Bible with gloss: Genesis [Microfiche 56120].
0020(14). Augustine, *De Genesi ad littera(m)*. Collection of Saint-Amand, estimated early twelfth century [Microfiche 56121].
0021(15). Bible with gloss: Genesis [Microfiche 56122].

EDITED SOURCES

Actes des comtes de Flandre: 1071–1128. Edited by Fernand Vercauteren. Brussels, 1938.
Acts of the Christian Martyrs. Translated by Herbert Musurillo. Oxford, 1972.
Aelred of Rievaulx. *De speculo caritatis*. Edited by A. Hoste and C.H. Talbot. CCCM 1. Turnhout, 1971.
Alan of Lille. *Summa de arte praedicatoria*. PL 210:111A-198A.
Alcuin. *Epistolae*. PL 100:139C-512B.
Alger of Liège. *De sacramentis corporis et sanguinis Dominici*. PL 180:739C-854C.
Alpert of Metz. *De diversitate temporum libri duo*. Edited by Hans van Rij and Anna Sapir Abulafia. Amsterdam, 1980.
Andrew of Strumi. *Vita sancti Arialdi*. Edited by F. Baethgen. MGH SS 30.2:1047–1075. Leipzig, 1934.
Annales Laubiensis. Edited by G. H. Pertz. MGH SS 4:9–28. Hannover, 1841.
Annales Mediolanensis. Edited by G. H. Pertz. MGH SS 18:357–382. Hannover, 1863.
Anselm of Canterbury, Saint. *De veritate (Über die Wahrheit)*. Edited by Markus Enders. Hamburg, 2001.
Anselm of Havelberg. *Epistola apologetica pro ordine canonicorum regularium*. PL 188:1117–1140A.
Arnulf of Milan. *Liber gestorum recentium*. Edited by Claudia Zey. MGH SSrGs 62. Hannover, 1994.
Augustine, Saint. *Commentary on the Lord's Sermon on the Mount*. Translated by Denis J. Kavanagh. New York, 1951.
——. *Concerning the City of God against the Pagans*. Translated by H. Bettenson. London, 1972.

——. *Confessiones*. Edited by L. Verheijen. CCSL 27. Turnhout, 1981.
——. *De baptismo contra donatistas*. Edited by M. Petschenig. CSEL 51. Leipzig, 1908.
——. *De civitate Dei*. Edited by Emanuel Hoffmann. CSEL 40/2. Prague, 1900.
——. *De civitate Dei libri XXII*. Edited by Bernhard Dombart and Alfons Kalb. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1928; orig. edition 1909.
——. *De Genesi ad litteram*. Edited by Joseph Zycha. CSEL 28.1. Prague, 1894.
——. *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*. Edited by Dorothea Weber. CSEL 91. Vienna, 1998.
——. *Expositions on the Book of Psalms*. Translated by A. Cleveland Coxe. Edited by Philip Schaff. Grand Rapids, MI, 1996.
——. *In Iohannis evangelium tractatus*. Edited by Augustine Mayer and R. Willems. CCSL 36. Turnhout, 1954.
____. *Quaestiones in Heptateuchum*. Edited by I. Fraipont. CCSL 33. Turnhout, 1958.
——. *The Writings against the Manichaeans and against the Donatists*. Translated by Philip Schaff. Edinburgh, 1996.
Babion, Geoffrey (sub voce Anselm of Laon). *Enarrationes in evangelium Matthaei*. PL 162:1227C–1500B.
Bede. *In Samuelem prophetam allegorica expositio*. PL 91:499A-714C.
Benzo of Alba. *Ad Heinricum*. Edited by Hans Seyffert. MGH SSrG 65. Hannover, 1996.
Bernard of Angers. *Liber miraculorum sancte Fidis*. Edited by A. Bouillet. Paris, 1897.
Bernard of Clairvaux. *De consideratione*. PL 182:727A-808A.
——. *De discrimine inter plebem et praesulem*. PL 183:726D-727B.
——. *Epistolae*. PL 182:67C-672A.
——. *Opera*. Vol. 8: *Epistolae extra corpus*. Edited by J. Leclercq and H. Rochais. Rome, 1977.
——. *Samtliche Werke lateinisch/deutsch*. Edited by Gerhard B. Winkler. Innsbruck, 1992.
——. *Sermones in Cantica Canticorum*. PL 183:785A-1198A.
——. *Sermons on Conversion*. Translated by Marie-Bernard Saïd. Kalamazoo, MI, 1981.
Bernold of Constance. *Chronicon*. Edited by G. H. Pertz. MGH SS 5:385–467. Hannover, 1844.
Berthold of Reichenau. *Annales*. Edited by G. H. Pertz. MGH SS 5:264–326. Hannover, 1844.
Biblia sacra cvm glossis, interlineari, et ordinaria, Nicolai Lyrani postilla ac moralitalibus. Venice, 1588.
Bonizo of Sutri. *Liber ad amicum*. Edited by Ernst Dümmler. MGH LDL 1:568–620. Hannover, 1891.
Boso. *Hadriani IV vita*. In *Pont. Rom*. 2:323–336.
——. *Vita Alexandri*. In *Pont. Rom*. 2:377–451.
Bruno of Merseburg. *Saxonicum bellum*. Edited by Hans-Eberhard Lohmann. MGH Deutsches Mittelalters 2. Leipzig, 1937.
Bruno of Segni. *Commentaria in Matthaeum*. PL 165:63A-514B.
——. *Expositio in Genesim*. PL 164:147C-234A.

——. *Sententiae*. PL 165:875C-1078D.

Chronica de gestis consulum Andegavorum. Vol. 1. Edited by Paul Marchegay and Emile Mabille. Paris, 1856.

Chronicon monasterii Sancti Petri Aniciensis. In *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Chaffre du Monastier, Ordre de Saint Benoit*, edited by Ulysse Chevalier, 151–166. Paris, 1884; reprint 1891.

Chronicon sancti Huberti Andaginensis. Edited by L. C. Bethmann and W. Wattenbach. MGH SS 8:565–630. Hannover, 1848.

Codagnelli, Giovanni. *Annales Placentini*. Edited by O. Holder-Egger. MGH SSrGs 23. Hannover, 1901.

Commemoratio superbie Ravennatis Archiepiscopi. Edited by Claudia Zey. MGH SSrGs 67. Hannover, 1994.

Concilium Lateranense III. In *Conciliorum oecumenicorum decreta*, edited by J. Alberigo et al., 205–225. Bologna, 1973.

Cyprian of Carthage. *De lapsis*. Edited by M Bévenot. CCSL 3. Turnhout, 1972.

——. *Epistulae*. Edited by W. Hartel. CSEL 3.2. Vienna, 1871.

Damian, Peter. *Die Briefe des Petrus Damiani*. Edited by Kurt Reindel. MGH Epp: Die Briefe der deutschen Kaizerzeit 4.1–4. Munich, 1983.——. *Expositio mystica historiarum libri Geneseos*. PL 145:841B-858A.

Dante Alighieri. *De monarchia*. Edited by E. Moore. Oxford, 1916.

De Sancto Ursmaro episcopo et abbate in Belgio. Acta SS 11:570–575.

Ebbo of Michelsberg. *Vita Ottonis episcopi Bambergensis*. Edited by R. Koepke. MGH SS 12:822–883. Hannover, 1856.

Epistolae Karolini aevi. Edited by Ernst Duemmler. MGH Epistolae 4. Berlin, 1895.

Folcuin. *Gesta abbatum Lobiensium*. Edited by G. H. Pertz. MGH SS 4:52–74. Hannover, 1841.

Friderici I Constitutiones. MGH Leges constitutiones et acta publica imperatorum et regum 1:191–463. Hannover, 1893.

Galbert of Bruges. *De multro, traditione, et occisione Gloriosi Karoli, Comitis Flandiarum*. Edited by Jeff Rider. CCCM 131. Turnhout, 1994.

——. *Passio Karoli comitis*. Edited by R. Koepke. MGH SS 12:561–619. Hannover, 1856.

Gerald of La Seuve-Majeure. *Miracula sancti Adalhardi*. PL 147:1063C-1078C.

Gerhoh of Reichersberg. *De investigatione Antichristi*. Edited by E. Sackur. MGH LDL 3:304–395. Hannover, 1897.

——. *De quarta vigilia noctis*. Edited by E. Sackur. MGH LDL 3:503–525. Hannover, 1897.

——. *Liber de aedificio Dei*. PL 194:1187A-1336A.

——. (*Opusculum*.) *Ex libro de edificio Dei*. Edited by E. Sackur. MGH LDL 3:136–202. Hannover, 1897.

Gesta abbatum Lobbiensium continuata. Edited by W. Arndt. MGH SS 21:307–33. Hannover, 1869.

Gesta domni Arnaldi. Edited by A. Ledru and G. Busso. In *Actus pontificum Cenomannis in urbe degentium*, 376–381. Le Mans, 1901.

Gesta episcoporum Cameracensium. Edited by L. C. Bethmann. MGH SS 7:393–525. Hannover, 1846.

Gesta episcoporum Mettensium. Edited by D. G. Waitz. MGH SS 10:531–551. Hannover, 1852.

Giry, Arthur, ed. *Documents sur les relations de la royauté avec les villes en France de 1180 à 1314*. Geneva, 1974; orig. 1885.

Gislbert of Mons. *La chronique de Gislbert de Mons (Chronicon Hanoniense)*. Edited by Leon Vanderkindere. Brussels, 1904.

Glaber, Raoul. *Historiarum libri quinque. Rodulphus Glaber, The Five Books of Histories*. Translated by John France. Oxford, 1989.

Godfrey of Vigeois. *Pars altera chronici Lemovicensis*. RHF 18:211–223.

Gregory the Great, Saint. *Homiliae in evangelia*. Edited by Raymond Étaix. CCSL 141. Turnhout, 1999.

——. *Homiliae in Hiezechihelem prophetam*. Edited by Marcus Adriaen. CCSL 142. Turnhout, 1971.

——. *Moralia in Job*. Edited by Marcus Adriaen. CCSL 143B. Turnhout, 1979.

——. *Pastoral Care*. Translated by Henry Davis. Westminster, MD, 1950.

——. *Regulae pastoralis liber*. PL 77:13A-128A.

Gregory VII, Pope. *The Epistolae vagantes*. Edited by H. E. J. Cowdrey. Oxford, 1972.

——. *The Register of Pope Gregory VII, 1073–1085: An English Translation*. Edited by H. E. J. Cowdrey. Oxford, 2002.

——. *Registrum*. In *Das Register Gregors VII*, vol. 1, edited by E. Caspar. MGH Epp. sel. 2.1. Berlin, 1920.

Guerric of Igny. *Sermones per annum*. PL 185:11A-220C.

Guibert of Nogent. *De buccella Judae data et de veritate dominici corporis*. Edited by R. Huygens. CCCM 127. Turnhout, 1993.

——. *A Monk's Confession (De vita sua)*. Translated by Paul J. Archambault. Philadelphia, 1996.

——. *Monodies*. In *Autobiographie*, edited by Edmond-René Labande. Paris, 1981.

——. *Monodies; and, On the relics of saints: The Autobiography and a Manifesto of a French Monk from the Time of the Crusades*. Translated by Joseph McAlhany and Jay Rubenstein. New York, 2011.

——. *Moralia in Genesin (Moralia Geneseos)*. PL 156:31C-338C.

Guitmund of Aversa. *La "Verita" dell'Eucaristia: De corporis et sanguinis Christi veritate*. Edited and translated by Luciano Orabona. Naples, 1995.

Haimo of Auxerre (sub voce Haimo of Halberstadt). *In divi Pauli epistolas expositio*. PL 117:361–938B.

Henry IV, King. *Die Briefe Heinrichs IV*. Edited by Carl Erdmann. MGH Deutsches Mittelalter Kritische Studientexte 1. Leipzig, 1937.

Herbord of Michelsberg. *Dialogus de vita Ottonis episcopi Babenbergensis*. Edited by Jan Wikarjak and Kazimierz Liman. Monumenta Poloniae Historica, Series Nova 4. Warsaw, 1974.

——. *Vita et perigrinatio Ottonis episcopi Bambergensis*. Edited by R. Koepke. MGH SS 12:746–822. Hannover, 1856.

Herman of Tournai. *Liber de restauratione monasterii sancti Martini Tornacensis*. Edited by G. Waitz. MGH SS 14:274–317. Hannover, 1883.

Hippolytus of Rome. *Commentaire sur Daniel.* Edited by Maurice Lefèvre. Paris, 1947.
Historia episcoporum Autissiodorensium. RHF 18:725–740.
Huberti, Ludwig, ed. *Studien zur Rechtsgeschichte der Gottesfrieden und Landfrieden. Erstes Buch: Die Friedensordnungen in Frankreich.* Ansbach, 1892.
Hugh of Saint-Victor. *Adnotationes elucidatoriae in Pentateuchon.* PL 175:29A-86D.
——. *Adnotatiunculae elucidatoriae in threnos Jeremiae.* PL 175:255D-322B.
——. *De archa Noe.* Edited by Patrice Sicard and Dominique Poirel. CCCM 176. Turnhout, 2001.
——. *De sacramentis Christianae fidae.* PL 176:173–618.
——. *De scripturis et scriptoribus sacris praenotationculae.* PL 175:9A-28D.
Hugh of Saint-Victor, incertus. *Allegoriae in vetus testamentum.* PL 175:635A-750C.
Hus, Jan. "On Simony." In *Advocates of Reform: From Wyclif to Erasmus,* edited and translated by Matthew Spinka, 196–278. Philadelphia, 1953.
Innocent III, Pope. *Sermones de sanctis.* PL 217:451A-596C.
Isaac of Stella. "The Letter on the Soul." Translated by Bernard McGinn. In *Three Treatises on Man: A Cistercian Anthropology*, edited by Bernard McGinn, 155–177. Kalamazoo, MI, 1977.
Isidore of Seville. *Etymologiarum sive originum.* Edited by W. M. Lindsay. 2 vols. Oxford, 1911.
Ivo of Chartres. *Epistolae.* PL 162:11D-287B.
Jerome, Saint. *Commentaria in epistolam ad Galatas.* PL 26:307A-438D.
——. *Commentariorum in Hiezechielem Libri IV.* Edited by F. Gloria. CCSL 75. Turnhout, 1964.
——. *Commentariorum in Matheum Libri IV.* Edited by D. Hurst and M. Adriaen. CCSL 77. Turnhout, 1969.
John of Saint-Arnoul. *Vita Iohannis abbatis Gorzienis. La vie de Jean, abbe de Gorze.* Translated by Michel Parisse. Paris, 1999.
——. *Vita Johannis Gorziensis.* Edited by G. H. Pertz. MGH SS 4:335–377. Hannover, 1841.
John of Salisbury. *Historia pontificalis.* Edited by Reginald Poole. Oxford, 1927.
____. *The Historia Pontificalis of John of Salisbury.* Edited and Translated by Marjorie Chibnall. Oxford, 1986; orig. 1956.
——. *Policraticus: Of the Frivolities of Courtiers and the Footprints of Philosophers.* Translated by Cary J. Nederman. Cambridge, 1990.
Lactantius. *De mortibus persecutorum.* Edited by J. L. Creed. Oxford, 1984.
——. *The Divine Institutes.* Translated by William Fletcher. Edited by A. Roberts and J. Donaldson. Edinburgh, 1871.
Landulf Senior. *Historia Mediolanensis.* Edited by L. C. Bethmann and W. Wattenbach. MGH SS 8:32–100. Hannover, 1848.
La Paix de Valenciennes de 1114. Edited by P. Godding and J. Pycke. Louvain, 1981.
Leo IX, Pope. *Epistolae et decreta pontifica.* PL 143:591B-794B.
Libellus de diversis ordinibus et professionibus qui sunt in aecclesia. Edited and translated by G. Constable and B. Smith. Oxford, 1972.
Liber de unitate ecclesiae conservanda. Edited by W. Schwenkenbecher. MGH LDL 2:173–284. Hannover, 1891.

Lombard, Peter. *Collectanea in omnes Pauli apostoli epistulas, epistolam I ad Timothaeum*. PL 192:1297A-1696C.

Ludus de Antichristo. Der Antichrist: Der staufische Ludus de Antichristo. Edited by Gerhard Günther. Hamburg, 1970.

Ludus de Antichristo. Edited by Gisela Vollmann-Profe. 2 vols. Göppingen, 1981.

Marsilius of Padua. *Defensor minor*. Edited by Cary J. Nederman. Cambridge, 1993.

——. *Defensor pacis*. Edited by C.W. Previté-Orton. Cambridge, 1928.

Miracula sancti Benedicti. Edited by E. de Certain. Paris, 1858.

Miracula sancti Ursmari in itinere per Flandriam facta. Edited by O. Holder-Egger. MGH SS 15/2:837–842. Hannover, 1888.

Optatus of Milevis. *Contra Donatistas*. Edited by Carl Ziwsa. CSEL 26. Vienna, 1863.

Otto of Freising. *Chronica sive historia de duabus civitatibus*. Edited by A. Hofmeister and Walther Lammers. Darmstadt, 1961.

——. *Chronicon: Sive historia de duabus civitatibus*. Edited by A. Hofmeister. MGH SSrGs 45. Hannover, 1912.

Otto of Freising and Rahewin. *Gesta Friderici I Imperatoris*. Edited by G. Waitz and B. von Simson. MGH SSrGs 46. Hannover, 1978; orig. 1912.

Paul of Bernried. *Vita Gregorii papae*. Edited by J. M. Watterich. In *Pontificum Romanorum vitae*, 474–545. Leipzig, 1862.

The Play of Antichrist. Translated by John Wright. Toronto, 1967.

Pseudo-Hugh of Saint-Victor, Circle of Robert of Melun. *Quaestiones et decisiones in epistolas D. Pauli*. PL 175:431C-633A.

Pseudo-Rupert of Deutz. *Chronica sancti Laurentii Leodiensis*. Edited by W. Wattenbach. MGH SS 8:261–279. Hannover, 1848.

Rigord. *Gesta Philippi Augusti*. In *Oeuvres de Rigord et Guillaume le Breton*, vol. 1, edited by H. François Delaborde. Paris, 1882.

Robert of Auxerre. *Chronologia*. RHF 18:247–290.

Rufinus. *Summa decretorum*. Edited by H. Singer. Paderborn, 1902.

Rufinus of Sorrento. *De bono pacis*. Edited by Roman Deutinger. MGH Studien und Texte 17. Hannover, 1997.

Rupert of Deutz. *Commentaria in Apocalypsim*. PL 169:825–993C.

——. *Commentaria in evangelium sancti Iohannis*. Edited by Rhaban Haacke. CCCM 9. Turnhout, 1969.

——. *De divinis officiis*. PL 170:11–332D.

——. *De gloria et honore Filii hominis super Mattheum*. Edited by Rhaban Haacke. CCCM 29. Turnhout, 1979.

——. *De victoria Verbi Dei*. Edited by Rhaban Haacke. MGH Quellen 5. Weimar, 1970.

——. *In regulam S. Benedicti*. PL 170:477D–538B.

Rupert of Deutz (attributed). *Chronica sancti Laurentii Leodiensis*. Edited by W. Wattenbach. MGH SS 8:261–279. Hannover, 1848.

Sigebert of Gembloux. *Epistola Leodicensium adversus Paschalem Papam*. Edited by E. Sackur. MGH LDL 2:449–464. Hannover, 1892.

The Song of Roland: An Analytical Edition. Edited by Gerard Brault. University Park, PA, 1978.

Stephan of Tournai. *Lettres d'Étienne de Tournai*. Edited by Jules Desilve. Valenciennes, 1893.

Tertullian. *Apologeticum*. Edited by E. Dekkers. CCSL 1. Turnhout, 1954.

____. *De baptismo*. Edited by J. G. Ph. Borleffs. CCSL 1. Turnhout, 1954.

——. *De idololatria*. Edited by A. Reifferscheid and G. Wissowa. CCSL 2. Turnhout, 1954.

——. *De pudicitia*. Edited by E. Dekkers. CCSL 2. Turnhout, 1954.

——. *De spectaculis*. Edited by E. Dekkers. CCSL 1. Turnhout, 1953.

——. *Liber de prescriptione haereticorum*. Edited by R. F. Refoulé. CCSL 1. Turnhout, 1954.

——. *Scorpiace*. Edited by A. Reifferscheid and G. Wissowa. CCSL 2. Turnhout, 1954.

Treatise on the Spirit and the Soul. Translated by Erasmo Leiva and Sister Benedicta. In *Three Treatises on Man: A Cistercian Anthropology*, edited by Bernard McGinn, 181–288. Kalamazoo, MI, 1977.

Treuga Dei dioecesis Tervanensis. Edited by Ludwig Weiland. MGH Const. 1:599–601. Hannover, 1893.

Tyconius. *Liber regularum*. Edited and translated by William S. Babcock. Atlanta, 1989.

Urban II, Pope. *Epistolae et privilegia*. *PL* 151.

Urkunden zu deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte im 10. 11. und 12. Jahrhundert. Edited by Georg Waitz. Berlin, 1886.

Vita Heinrici IV imperatoris. Edited by W. Eberhard. MGH SSrGs 58. Hannover, 1899.

Vita Leonis noni. La vie du Pape Léon IX (Brunon, évêque de Toul). Edited by Michel Parisse and Monique Goullet. Paris, 1997.

Waddell, Chrysogonous, ed. *Narrative and Legislative Texts from Early Cîteaux*. Nuits-Saint-Georges, 1999.

Wido of Ferrara. *De scismate Hildebrandi*. Edited by R. Wilmans and E. Duemmler. MGH LDL 1:529–567. Hannover, 1891.

Widukind of Corvey. *Res gestae Saxonicae*. Edited by P. Hirsch and H.-E. Lohmann. MGH SSrGus 60. Hannover, 1935.

William of Saint-Thierry. *De natura corporis et animae libri duo*. PL 180.

Secondary Sources

N.B.: In cases where an edited volume includes more than one of the essays cited below, I have also cited the edited volume separately. In all other cases, I have cited the essay alone.

Althoff, Gerd. *Family, Friends, and Followers: Political and Social Bonds in Medieval Europe*. Cambridge, 2004.

——. *Heinrich IV*. Darmstadt, 2006.

——. *Otto III*. University Park, PA, 2003.

Asad, Talal. "On Discipline and Humility in Medieval Christian Monasticism." In *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam*, 125–167. Baltimore, 1993.

Bagge, Sverre. "Ideas and Narrative in Otto of Freising's *Gesta Frederici*." *Journal of Medieval History* 22.4 (1996): 345–377.

Baldwin, Marshall Whithed. *Alexander III and the Twelfth Century*. Glen Rock, NJ, 1968.

Baraz, Daniel. *Medieval Cruelty: Changing Perceptions, Late Antiquity to the Early Modern Period*. Ithaca, NY, 2003.

Barnes, Timothy David. *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study*. Oxford, 1971.

Barthélemy, Dominique. "The 'Feudal Revolution'" (I). *Past and Present* 152 (Aug. 1996): 196–205.

——. *La mutation de l'an mil, a-t-elle eu lieu? Servage et chevalerie dans la France des Xe et XIe siècles*. Paris, 1997.

——. "La paix de Dieu dans son contexte (989–1041)." *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale* 40 (1997): 3–35.

——. *The Serf, the Knight, and the Historian*. Ithaca, NY, 2009.

Bartlett, Robert. *The Making of Europe: Conquest, Colonization, and Cultural Change, 950–1350*. Princeton, NJ, 1993.

Barton, Richard E. "Zealous Anger and the Renegotiation of Aristocratic Relationships." In Rosenwein, *Anger's Past*, 153–170.

Bedos-Rezak, Brigitte. "Medieval Identity: A Sign and a Concept." *American Historical Review* 105.5 (2000): 1489–1533.

Bell, David N. *The Image and Likeness: The Augustinian Spirituality of William of St Thierry*. Kalamazoo, MI, 1984.

Bériou, Nicole, and Jacques Chiffoleau. *Économie et religion: L'expérience des ordres mendiants, XIIIe-XVe siècle*. Lyon, 2009.

Berman, Constance H. *The Cistercian Evolution: The Invention of a Religious Order in Twelfth-Century Europe*. Philadelphia, 2000.

Bernhardt, John William. *Itinerant Kingship and Royal Monasteries in Early Medieval Germany: c. 936–1075*. Cambridge, 1993.

Besserman, Lawrence L. *Sacred and Secular in Medieval and Early Modern Cultures: New Essays*. New York, 2006.

Bhabha, Homi K. "Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse." In *The Location of Culture*, 85–92. London, 1994.

Billado, Tracey L. "The Politics of Evil Customs in Eleventh-Century Anjou (France)." PhD diss., Emory University, 2006.

——. "Rhetorical Strategies and Legal Arguments: 'Evil Customs' and Saint-Florent de Saumur, 979–1011." In *Oral History of the Middle Ages: The Spoken Word in Context,* edited by Gerhard Jaritz and Michael Richter, 128–141. Budapest, 2001.

Bischoff, Guntram Gerhard. "The Eucharistic Controversy between Rupert of Deutz and His Anonymous Adversary: Studies in the Theology and Chronology of Rupert of Deutz (c1076–c1129) and His Earlier Literary Work." PhD diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1965.

Bisson, Thomas N. *The Crisis of the Twelfth Century: Power, Lordship, and the Origins of European Government*. Princeton, NJ, 2009.

——. "The 'Feudal Revolution.'" *Past and Present* 142 (Feb. 1994): 6–42.

——. "The Organized Peace in Southern France and Catalonia, ca. 1140-ca. 1233." *American Historical Review* 82 (1977): 290–310.

Bloch, Marc Léopold Benjamin. *Feudal Society*. Chicago, 1961.

Blumenthal, Uta-Renate. "Canossa and Royal Ideology in 1077: Two Unknown Manuscripts of *De penitentia regis Salomonis*." *Manuscripta* 22 (1978): 91-96. Reprint, Aldershot, UK, 1998.

____. *The Investiture Controversy: Church and Monarchy from the Ninth to the Twelfth Century*. Philadelphia, 1988.

Bois, Guy. *The Transformation of the Year 1000: The Village of Lournand from Antiquity to Feudalism*. Manchester, UK, 1992.

Bonnassie, Pierre. "La Catalogne du milieu du Xe à la fin du XIe siècle: Croissance et mutations d'une société." 2 vols. Thesis, Association des publications de l'Université de Toulouse-Le Mirail, 1973, 1975.

Bonnaud Delamare, Roger. "Les institutions de paix dans la provence ecclésiastique de Reims au onzième siècle." *Bulletin philologique et historique du comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques (jusqu'à 1715)* (1957): 148–153.

——. *L'idée de paix à l'époque carolingienne*. Paris, 1939.

Bouchard, Constance Brittain. *Sword, Miter, and Cloister: Nobility and the Church in Burgundy, 980–1198*. Ithaca, NY, 1987.

Boureau, Alain. *Satan the Heretic: The Birth of Demonology in the Medieval West*. Translated by Teresa Lavender Fagan. Chicago, 2006.

Brigué, Louis. *Alger de Liége: Un théologien de l'eucharistie au début du XIIe siècle; Thèse pour le doctorat en théologie*. Paris, 1936.

Brown, Peter. *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography*. Berkeley, 1967.

——. *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*. New York, 1988.

——. "The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity." *Journal of Roman Studies* 61 (1971): 80–101.

——. "St. Augustine's Attitude to Religious Coercion." *Journal of Roman Studies* 54 (1964): 107–116.

Brühl, Carlrichard. *Fodrum, gistum, servitium regis: Studien zu den wirtschaftlichen Grundlagen des Königtums im Frankenreich und in den fränkischen Nachfolgestaaten Deutschland, Frankreich und Italien vom 6. bis zur Mitte des 14. Jahrhunderts*. Cologne, 1968.

Buc, Philippe. *The Dangers of Ritual: Between Early Medieval Texts and Social Scientific Theory*. Princeton, NJ, 2001.

——. "Exégèse et violence dans la tradition occidental." *Annali di storia moderna e contemporanea* 16 (2010): 131–144.

——. *L'ambiguïté du livre: Prince, pouvoir, et peuple dans les commentaires de la Bible au Moyen Âge*. Paris, 1994.

——. "Some Thoughts on the Christian Theology of Violence, Medieval and Modern, from the Middle Ages to the French Revolution." *Rivista di storia del Cristianesimo* 5.1 (2008): 9–28.

Bynum, Caroline W. "Did the Twelfth Century Discover the Individual?" In *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages*, 82–108. Berkeley, 1982.

——. *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women*. Berkeley, 1987.

Caciola, Nancy. *Discerning Spirits: Divine and Demonic Possession in the Middle Ages*. Ithaca, NY, 2003.

Caffiaux, H. "Memoire sur la charte de la frairie de la halle basse de Valenciennes (XIe et XII siecles)." *Memoires de la Société Nationale des Antiquaires de France* 4.8 (1877): 1–41.

Caspary, Gerard E. *Politics and Exegesis: Origen and the Two Swords*. Berkeley, 1979.

Cassell, Anthony K. *The Monarchia Controversy: An Historical Study with Accompanying Translations of Dante Alighieri's "Monarchia," Guido Vernani's "Refutation of the Monarchia composed by Dante," and Pope John XXII's Bull "Si fratrum."* Washington, DC, 2004.

Chenu, Marie-Dominique. "Monks, Canons, and Laymen in Search of the Apostolic Life." Translated by Jerome Taylor and Lester K. Little. In *Nature, Man, and Society in the Twelfth Century: Essays on New Theological Perspectives in the Latin West*, 202–238. Chicago, 1968.

——. *Nature, Man, and Society in the Twelfth Century: Essays on New Theological Perspectives in the Latin West*. Translated by Jerome Taylor and Lester Little. Chicago, 1968.

——. "Theology and the New Awareness of History." In *Nature, Man, and Society*, 162–201. Chicago, 1968.

Cheyette, Fredric. "The Invention of the State." In *Essays on Medieval Civilization*, edited by B. K. Ladner and K.R. Philp, 143–178. Austin TX, 1978.

——. "Suum cuique tribuere." *French Historical Studies* 6 (1970): 287–299.

Cheyette, Fredric, and Howell Chickering. "Love, Anger, and Peace: Social Practice and Poetic Play in the Ending of Yvain." *Speculum* 80.1 (2005): 104–112.

Christiansen, Eric. *The Northern Crusades*. 2nd new ed. London, 1997.

Chroust, Anton-Hermann. "The Corporate Idea and the Body Politic in the Middle Ages." *Review of Politics* 60 (1947): 423–452.

Cohen, Esther, and Mayke De Jong. *Medieval Transformations: Texts, Power, and Gifts in Context*. Leiden, 2001.

Cohn, Norman. *The Pursuit of the Millennium: Revolutionary Millenarians and Mystical Anarchists of the Middle Ages*. Fairlawn, NJ, 1957; repr., Oxford, 1970.

Coleman, Edward. "Italian Communes: Recent Work and Current Trends." *Journal of Medieval History* 25.4 (1999): 392–393.

——. "Representative Assemblies in Communal Italy." In *Political Assemblies in the Earlier Middle Ages*, edited by P. S. Barnwell and Marco Mostert, 196–200. Turnhout, 2003.

Congar, Yves. "Maître Rufino et son *De bono pacis*." *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 41 (1957): 428–444.

Cowdrey, H. E. J. "Archbishop Aribert II of Milan." *History: The Journal of the Historical Association* 2 (1966): 1–15.

——. "The Papacy, the Patarenes, and the Church of Milan." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 18, ser. 5 (1968): 25–48.

——. "The Peace and the Truce of God in the Eleventh Century." *Past and Present* 46 (Feb. 1970): 42–67.

——. *Pope Gregory VII, 1073–1085*. Oxford, 1998.

Dalton, Paul. "Churchmen and the Promotion of Peace in King Stephen's Reign." *Viator* 31 (2000): 79–119.

De Hamel, Christopher. *Glossed Books of the Bible and the Origins of the Paris Booktrade*. Woodbridge, UK, 1984.

Desportes, Pierre. "Les origines de la commune d'Amiens." In *Pouvoirs et libertés au temps des premiers Capétiens,* edited by Elisabeth Magnou-Nortier, 247–265. Maulévrier, 1992.

Dessì, Rosa-Maria. *Prêcher la paix et discipliner la société: Italie, France, Angleterre (XIIIe-XVe siècles)*. Turnhout, 2005.

Devroey, Jean-Pierre. *Le Polyptyque et les listes de biens de l'Abbaye Saint-Pierre de Lobbes: IXe-XIe siècles*. Brussels, 1986.

Diestelkamp, Bernhard. *Beiträge zum hochmittelalterlichen Städtewesen*. Cologne, 1982.

Dubar, Luc. "Les communes de Corbie et d'Amiens (Amiens 1117–1123)." In *Les chartres et le movement communal: Colloque régional (octobre 1980) organisé en commémoration du 9e centenaire de la Commune de Saint-Quentin*, 113–122. Saint-Quentin, 1982.

Duby, Georges. *The Chivalrous Society*. Translated by Cynthia Postan. Berkeley, 1977.

——. "The Evolution of Judicial Institutions." In *The Chivalrous Society*, 15–58.

——. "Laity and the Peace of God." In *The Chivalrous Society*, 123–133.

——. *The Three Orders: Feudal Society Imagined*. Translated by Arthur Goldhammer. Chicago, 1980.

Dudziak, Mary L. "Law, War, and the History of Time." *California Law Review* 98 (Oct. 2010): 1669–1712.

Dunn, Geoffrey D. *Tertullian*. New York, 2004.

Dutton, Marsha L. "Sancto Dunstano Cooperante: Collaboration between King and Ecclesiastical Advisor in Aelred of Rievaulx's *Genealogy of the Kings of the English*." In *Religious and Laity in Western Europe, 1000–1400: Interaction, Negotiation, and Power*, edited by Emilia Jamroziak and Janet Burton, 183–195. Turnhout, 2006.

Elliott, Dyan. *Fallen Bodies: Pollution, Sexuality, and Demonology in the Middle Ages*. Middle Ages Series. Philadelphia, 1999.

——. *Proving Woman: Female Spirituality and Inquisitional Culture in the Later Middle Ages*. Princeton, NJ, 2004.

Erdmann, Carl. *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*. Translated by Marshall W. Baldwin and Walter Goffart. Princeton, NJ, 1977.

Evans, R.F. "On the Problem of Church and Empire in Tertullian's *Apologeticum*." *Studia patristica* 14 (1976): 21–36.

Ferguson, James. "Of Mimicry and Membership: Africans and the 'New World Society'." In *Global Shadows: Africa in the Neoliberal World Order*, 155–175. Durham, NC, 2006.

Foucault, Michel. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. New York, 1994.

Foulon, Jean-Hervé. "Le clerc et son image dans la prédication synodale de Geoffroy Babion, archevêque de Bordeaux (1136–1158)." In *Le clerc séculier au Moyen Âge: XXIIe Congrès de la Société des Historiens Médiévistes de l'Enseignement Supérieur Public (Amiens, juin 1991)*, 45–60. Paris, 1993.

Frend, W. H. C. *The Donatist Church: A Movement of Protest in Roman North Africa.* Oxford, 1952.

——. *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church: A Study of a Conflict from the Maccabees to Donatus.* New York, 1967.

Garnett, George. *Marsilius of Padua and "the Truth of History."* Oxford, 2006.

Geary, Patrick J. "Humiliation of Saints." In *Living with the Dead*, 95–115.

——. "Living with Conflicts in Stateless France: A Typology of Conflict Management Mechanisms, 1050–1200." In *Living with the Dead*, 145–159.

——. *Living with the Dead in the Middle Ages.* Ithaca, NY, 1994.

——. "Sacred Commodities: The Circulation of Medieval Relics." In *Living with the Dead*, 194–218.

Genêt, Jean-Philippe. *L'historiographie médiévale en Europe: Actes du colloque organisé par la Fondation européenne de la science au Centre de recherches historiques et juridiques de l'Université Paris I du 29 mars au 1er avril 1989.* Paris, 1991.

Gewirth, Alan. *Marsilius of Padua.* New York, 1979.

——. *Marsilius of Padua, the Defender of Peace.* Vol. 1: *Marsilius of Padua and Medieval Political Philosophy.* New York, 1951.

Gluckman, Max. "The Peace in the Feud." *Past and Present* 8 (1955): 1–14.

Goetz, Hans-Werner. "On the Universality of Universal History." In *L'historiographie médiévale en Europe,* edited by Jean-Philippe Genêt, 247–261. Paris, 1991.

——. "Protection of the Church, Defense of the Law, and Reform: On the Purposes and Character of the Peace of God, 989–1038." In Head and Landes, *The Peace of God*, 259–279.

Görich, Knut. *Die Ehre Friedrich Barbarossas: Kommunikation, Konflikt und politisches Handeln im 12. Jahrhundert.* Darmstadt, 2001.

Greenaway, George William. *Arnold of Brescia.* Cambridge, 1931.

Grundmann, Herbert. *Religious Movements in the Middle Ages: The Historical Links between Heresy, the Mendicant Orders, and the Women's Religious Movement in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Century, with the Historical Foundations of German Mysticism.* Notre Dame, IN, 1995.

Hallinger, Kassius. *Gorze-Kluny: Studien zu den monastischen Lebensformen und Gegensätzen im Hochmittelalter.* Rome, 1950.

Häring, Nicholas. "Berengar's Definitions of *Sacramentum* and Their Influence on Mediaeval Sacramentology." *Medieval Studies* 10 (1948): 109–146.

——. "A Study in the Sacramentology of Alger of Liége." *Medieval Studies* 20 (1958): 41–78.

Harnack, Adolf von. *"Militia Christi": The Christian Religion and the Military in the First Three Centuries.* Philadelphia, 1981.

Haskins, Charles Homer. *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century.* Cambridge, 1927.

Head, Thomas. "The Judgment of God: Andrew of Fleury's Account of the Peace League of Bourges." In Head and Landes, *The Peace of God*, 219–238.

Head, Thomas, and Richard Allen Landes, eds. *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000.* Ithaca, NY, 1992.

Hein, Kenneth. *Eucharist and Excommunication: A Study in Early Christian Doctrine and Discipline.* Bern, 1973.

Hillenbrand, Carole. *The Crusades: Islamic Perspectives.* New York, 2000.

Hinchliff, Peter Bingham. *Cyprian of Carthage and the Unity of the Christian Church.* London, 1974.

Hoffmann, Hartmut. *Gottesfriede und Treuga Dei.* Schriften der Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Stuttgart, 1964.

Huberti, Ludwig. *Studien zur rechtsgeschichte der Gottesfrieden und Landfrieden.* Ansbach, 1892.

Hyde, John Kenneth. *Society and and Politics in Medieval Italy: The Evolution of the Civil Life, 1000–1350.* London, 1973.

Iogna-Prat, Dominique. "Le 'baptême' du schéma des trois ordres fonctionne: L'apport de l'école d'Auxerre dans la seconde moitié du IXe siècle." *Annales E.S.C.* 41.1 (1986): 43–61.

——. *Order and Exclusion: Cluny and Christendom Face Heresy, Judaism, and Islam (1000–1150).* Translated by Graham Edwards. Ithaca, NY, 2002.

Jaeger, C. Stephen. *The Envy of Angels: Cathedral Schools and Social Ideals in Medieval Europe, 950–1200.* Philadelphia, 1994.

Jamroziak, Emilia. *Rievaulx Abbey and Its Social Context, 1132–1300: Memory, Locality, and Networks.* Turnhout, 2005.

Jamroziak, Emilia, and Janet E. Burton. *Religious and Laity in Western Europe, 1000–1400: Interaction, Negotiation, andPower.* Turnhout, 2006.

Jayakumar, Shashi. "Some Reflections on the 'Foreign Policies' of Edgar 'the Peaceable.'" *Haskins Society Journal* 10 (2001): 17–37.

Jestice, Phyllis G. "The Gorzian Reform and the Light under the Bushel." *Viator* 24 (1993): 51–78.

——. *Wayward Monks and the Religious Revolution of the Eleventh Century.* Leiden, 1997.

Jones, P. J. *The Italian City-State: From Commune to Signoria.* Oxford, 1997.

Jussen, Bernhard. *Ordering Medieval Society: Perspectives on Intellectual and Practical Modes of Shaping Social Relations.* Philadelphia, 2000.

Keleher, James P. *Saint Augustine's Notion of Schism in the Donatist Controversy.* Mundelein, IL, 1961.

Keller, Hagen. "Der Übergang zur Kommune: Zur Entwicklung der italienischen Stadtverfassung im 11 Jahrhundert." In *Beiträge zum Hochmittelalterlichen Städtwesen,* edited by Bernhard Diestelkamp, 55–71. Cologne, 1982.

——. "Die Entstehung der italienischen Stadtkommunen als Problem der Sozialgeschichte." *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 10 (1976): 169–211.

Kennelly, Dolorosa. "Medieval Towns and the Peace of God." *Medievalia et humanistica* 15 (1962): 35–53.

Koziol, Geoffrey. "Monks, Feuds, and the Making of Peace." In Head and Landes, *The Peace of God*, 239–259.

Lackner, Bede K. *The Eleventh-Century Background of Cîteaux.* Washington, DC, 1972.

Ladner, Gerhart B. *The Idea of Reform: Its Impact on Christian Thought and Action in the Age of the Fathers.* Rev. ed. New York, 1967.

Lampérez y Romea, Vicente. "El real monasterio de Fitero en Navarra." *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia* 46 (1905): 288–290.

Landgraf, Arthur Michael. *Introduction à l'histoire de la littérature de la scolastique naissante.* Montreal, 1973.

Langmuir, Gavin I. *History, Religion, and Antisemitism*. Berkeley, 1990.

Leclercq, Jean. "New Recruitment, New Psychology." In *Monks and Love in Twelfth-Century France: Psycho-Historical Essays*, 8–26. Oxford, 1979.

——. *Saint Pierre Damien, ermite et homme d'église*. Rome, 1960.

Lees, Jay T. *Anselm of Havelberg: Deeds into Words in the Twelfth Century*. Leiden, 1998.

Le Goff, Jacques. *The Birth of Purgatory*. Chicago, 1984.

——. "The Symbolic Ritual of Vassalage." In *Time, Work, and Culture in the Middle Ages*, translated by Arthur Goldhammer, 237–287. Chicago, 1980; Fr. orig. 1977.

Lewis, Suzanne. "Encounters with Monsters at the End of Time: Some Early Medieval Visualizations of Apocalyptic Eschatology." *Different Visions* 2 (June 2010): 1–76.

Leyser, Conrad. *Authority and Asceticism from Augustine to Gregory the Great*. Oxford, 2000.

Little, Lester K. *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy in Medieval Europe*. Ithaca, NY, 1978.

Lobrichon, Guy. *La Bible au Moyen Âge*. Paris, 2003.

——. "Une nouveauté: Les gloses de la Bible." In *Le Moyen Âge et la Bible,* edited by Pierre Riché and Guy Lobrichon, 95–114. Paris, 1984.

Lottin, Odon. "Nouveaux fragments théologiques de l'école d'Anselme de Laon: Florilèges de Saint-Amand." *RTAM* 11 (1939): 308–312.

——. *Psychologie et morale aux XIIe et XIIIe siécles*. 2nd ed. Gembloux, 1957.

Lubac, Henri de. *Corpus mysticum: L'Eucharistie et l'Église au Moyen Âge; Étude historique*. 2nd ed. Paris, 1949.

——. *Medieval Exegesis: The Four Senses of Scripture*. Translated by E. M. Macierowski. Vol. 2. Grand Rapids, MI, 2000.

Luscombe, David, et al. *The New Cambridge Medieval History*. Vol. 4, pt. 2: *C. 1024–c. 1198*. New York, 2004.

MacDonald, Allan John. *Berengar and the Reform of Sacramental Doctrine*. New York, 1930.

Mackinney, Loren. "The People and Popular Opinion in the Eleventh-Century Peace of God." *Speculum* 5.2 (1930): 181–206.

Magnou-Nortier, Elisabeth, and Pierre Desportes. *Pouvoirs et libertés au temps des premiers Capétiens*. Maulévrier, 1992.

Maiolo, Francesco. *Medieval Sovereignty: Marsilius of Padua and Bartolus of Saxoferrato*. Delft, 2007.

Malegam, Jehangir Y. "Love between Peace and Violence: Not a Crisis but a Critique of Fidelity after 1000." *Quaestiones Medii Aevi novae* 16 (2011): 321–336.

——. "No Peace for the Wicked: Conflicting Visions of Peacemaking in an Eleventh-Century Monastic Narrative." *Viator* 39.1 (2008): 23–49.

Markus, R. A. *The End of Ancient Christianity*. Cambridge, 1990.

——. *Saeculum: History and Society in the Theology of St. Augustine*. Rev. ed. Cambridge, 1988.

——. *Signs and Meanings: World and Text in Ancient Christianity*. Liverpool, 1996.

Martin-Chabot, E. "Deux bulles closes originales d'Alexandre III." *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire, École française de Rome* 24 (1904): 65–74.

Moore, R. I. *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Authority and Deviance in Western Europe, 950–1250.* 2nd ed. Malden, MA, 2007.

——. *The Origins of European Dissent.* New York, 1985.

Morris, Colin. *The Papal Monarchy: The Western Church from 1050 to 1250.* Oxford, 1989.

Morrison, Karl Frederick. *The Mimetic Tradition of Reform in the West.* Princeton, NJ, 1982.

——. *Tradition and Authority in the Western Church, 300–1140.* Princeton, NJ, 1969.

——. *The Two Kingdoms: Ecclesiology in Carolingian Political Thought.* Princeton, NJ, 1964.

Munz, Peter. *Frederick Barbarossa: A Study in Medieval Politics.* Ithaca, NY, 1969.

Newman, Martha G. *The Boundaries of Charity: Cistercian Culture and Ecclesiastical Reform, 1098–1180.* Stanford, CA, 1996.

Nightingale, John. *Monasteries and Patrons in the Gorze Reform: Lotharingia, c. 850–1000.* Oxford, 2001.

North, William. "In the Shadows of Reform: Exegesis and the Formation of a Clerical Elite in the Works of Bruno, Bishop of Segni (1078/9–1123)." PhD diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1998.

____. "Polemic, Apathy, and Authorial Initiative in Gregorian Rome: The Curious Case of Bruno of Segni." *Haskins Society Journal* 10 (2001): 115–125.

O'Callaghan, Joseph F. "The Affiliation of the Order of Calatrava with the Order of Cîteaux." In *The Spanish Military Order of Calatrava and Its Affiliates*, no. 1. London, 1975.

Oexle, Otto Gerhard. "Pax und Pactum: Rufinus von Sorrent und sein Traktat über den Frieden." In *Italia et Germania: Liber Amicorum Arnold Esch*, edited by Hagen Keller, Werner Paravicini, and Wolfgang Schieder, 539–555. Tübingen, 2001.

——. "Peace through Conspiracy." Translated by Pamela Selwyn. In *Ordering Medieval Society: Perspectives on Intellectual and Practical Modes of Shaping Social Relations*, edited by Bernhard Jussen, 285–322. Philadelphia, 2001.

Ott, John S. "'Both Mary and Martha': Bishop Lietbert of Cambrai and the Construction of Episcopal Sanctity in a Border Diocese around 1100." In Ott and Jones, *The Bishop Reformed*, 137–160.

——. "Guardians upon the Walls of This Terrestrial Jerusalem: Bishops, Episcopal Authority, and Community in Northern France, ca. 1070–1150." PhD diss., Stanford University, 1999.

Ott, John S., and Anna Trumbore Jones, eds. *The Bishop Reformed: Studies of Episcopal Power and Culture in the Central Middle Ages.* Aldershot, UK, 2007.

Parisse, Michel. "L'Abbaye de Gorze dans le contexte politique et religieux lorrain à l'époque de Jean de Vandières (900-974)." In *L'abbaye de Gorze au Xe siècle*, edited by Michel Parisse and Otto Gerhard Oexle, 51–85. Nancy, 1993.

Patzold, Steffen. *Konflikte im Kloster: Studien zu Auseinandersetzungen in monastischen Gemeinschaften des ottonische-salischen Reichs.* Husum, 2000.

Paxton, Frederick. "History, Historians, and the Peace of God." In Head and Landes, *The Peace of God*, 21–40.

Petit-Dutaillis, Charles. *The French Communes in the Middle Ages*. Translated by Joan Vickers. Amsterdam, 1978.

——. *Les communes françaises: Caractéres et évolution des origines au XVIIIe siécle*. Paris, 1970.

Petkov, Kiril. *The Kiss of Peace: Ritual, Self, and Society in the High and Late Medieval West*. Leiden, 2003.

Phillips, Jonathan. *The Second Crusade: Extending the Frontiers of Christendom*. New Haven, CT, 2007.

Poly, Jean-Pierre, and Eric Bournazel. *The Feudal Transformation: 900–1200*. New York, 1991.

Powell, James M. *Albertanus of Brescia: The Pursuit of Happiness in the Early Thirteenth Century*. Philadelphia, 1992.

Quasten, Johannes. *Patrology*. 4 vols. Westminster, MD, 1950.

Remensnyder, Amy G. "Pollution, Purity, and Peace: An Aspect of Social Reform between the Late Tenth Century and 1076." In Head and Landes, *The Peace of God*, 280–307.

——. *Remembering Kings Past: Monastic Foundation Legends in Medieval Southern France*. Ithaca, NY, 1995.

Reuter, Timothy. *Germany in the Early Middle Ages, c. 800–1056*. New York, 1991.

Riches, T. M. "Bishop Gerard I of Cambrai-Arras, the Three Orders, and the Problem of Human Weakness." In Ott and Jones, *The Bishop Reformed*, 122–134.

Rider, Jeff. *God's Scribe: The Historiographical Art of Galbert of Bruges*. Washington, DC, 2001.

Riley-Smith, Jonathan. "Crusading as an Act of Love." *History* 65 (1980): 177–192.

Robinson, I. S. *Authority and Resistance in the Investiture Contest: The Polemical Literature of the Late Eleventh Century*. Manchester, UK, 1978.

——. *Henry IV of Germany, 1056–1106*. Cambridge, 1999.

——. *The Papacy, 1073–1198: Continuity and Innovation*. Cambridge, 1990.

——. *The Papal Reform of the Eleventh Century: Lives of Pope Leo IX and Pope Gregory VII*. Manchester, UK, 2004.

Rosenwein, Barbara H. *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages*. Ithaca, NY, 1998.

——. "Feudal War and Monastic Peace: Cluniac Liturgy as Ritual Aggression." *Viator* 2 (1971): 129–157.

Rubenstein, Jay. *Guibert of Nogent: Portrait of a Medieval Mind*. New York, 2002.

Rubin, Miri. *Gentile Tales: The Narrative Assault on Late Medieval Jews*. New Haven, CT, 1999.

Schmitz-Esser, Romedio. "Arnold of Brescia in Exile: April 1139 to December 1143—His Role as a Reformer, Reviewed." In *Exile in the Middle Ages: Selected Proceedings from the International Medieval Congress, University of Leeds, 8–11 July 2002*, ed. by Laura Napran and Elisabeth van Houts. Turnhout, 2004, 213–232.

Sizgorich, Thomas. *Violence and Belief in Late Antiquity: Militant Devotion in Christianity and Islam*. Philadelphia, 2009.

Smalley, Beryl. *The Becket Conflict and the Schools: A Study of Intellectuals in Politics*. Totowa, NJ, 1973.

——. "Gilbertus Universalis, Bishop of London (1128–34) and the Problem of the 'Glossa Ordinaria'." *RTAM* 7 (1935).

——. *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*. 3rd ed. Oxford, 1983.

Smith, Lesley. *The "Glossa ordinaria": The Making of a Medieval Bible Commentary*. Leiden, 2009.

Somerville, Robert. *Pope Alexander III and the Council of Tours (1163): A Study of Ecclesiastical Politics and Institutions in the Twelfth Century*. Berkeley, 1977.

Southern, R. W. *The Making of the Middle Ages*. London, 1953.

Spijker, Ineke van 't. *Fictions of the Inner Life: Religious Literature and the Formation of the Self in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*. Turnhout, 2004.

Stein, Robert M. "Sacred Authority and Secular Power: The Historical Argument of the *Gesta episcoporum Cameracensium*." In *Sacred and Secular in Medieval and Early Modern Cultures: New essays*, edited by Lawrence Besserman, 149–166. New York, 2006.

Stock, Brian. *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* Princeton, NJ, 1983.

Straw, Carole Ellen. *Gregory the Great: Perfection in Imperfection*. Berkeley, 1988.

Sullivan, Richard Eugene, Bede K. Lackner, and Kenneth R. Philp. *Essays on Medieval Civilization*. Austin, TX, 1978.

Swann, William S. "The Relationship between Penance, Reconciliation with the Church, and Admission to the Eucharist in the Letters and the *De lapsis* of Cyprian of Carthage." PhD diss., Catholic University of America, 1981.

Tabacco, Giovanni. "Northern and Central Italy in the Eleventh Century." In *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, edited by D. Luscombe and J. Riley-Smith, 72–93. Cambridge, 2004.

——. *The Struggle for Power in Medieval Italy: Structures of Political Rule*. Cambridge, 1989.

Tabbernee, William "Review: Maureen Tilley, *The Bible in Christian North Africa: The Donatist World* (Minneapolis, 1996)." *Church History* 67 (Dec. 1998): 750.

Taussig, Michael T. *Mimesis and Alterity: A Particular History of the Senses*. New York, 1993.

Taylor, Pegatha "Moral Agency in Crusade and Colonization: Anselm of Havelberg and the Wendish Crusade of 1147." *International History Review* 22.4 (Dec. 2000): 757–783.

Tellenbach, Gerd, *Church, State, and Christian Society at the Time of the Investiture Contest*. Translated by Ralph Francis Bennett. Oxford, 1940.

Thompson, Augustine. *Cities of God: The Religion of the Italian Communes, 1125–1325*. University Park, PA, 2005.

——. *Revival Preachers and Politics in Thirteenth-Century Italy: The Great Devotion of 1233*. Oxford, 1992.

Tilley, Maureen A. *The Bible in Christian North Africa: The Donatist World*. Minneapolis, 1997.

Van den Eynde, Damien. "Autour des 'Enarrationes in Evangelium S. Matthaei' attribuées à Geoffroi Babion." *RTAM* 26 (1959): 50–84.

Van Engen, John H. *Rupert of Deutz*. Berkeley, 1983.

Van Meter, David C. "The Peace of Amiens-Corbie and Gerard of Cambrai's Oration on the Three Functional Orders: The Date, the Context, the Rhetoric." *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 74.3–4 (1996): 632–657.

Vauchez, André. *The Laity in the Middle Ages: Religious Beliefs and Devotional Practices*. Translated by Daniel Ethan Bornstein. Notre Dame, IN, 1993; Fr. orig. 1987.

——. "La paix dans les mouvements religieux populaires (XIe-XVe siècle)." In *Pace e guerra nel basso Medioevo: Atti del XL Convegno storico internazionale, Todi, 12–14 ottobre 2003*, 313–334. Spoleto, 2004.

Verbruggen, J. F. *The Art of Warfare in Western Europe during the Middle Ages: From the Eighth Century to 1340*. 2nd ed. Woodbridge, UK, 1997.

Verhulst, Adriaan E. *The Rise of Cities in North-West Europe*. Cambridge, 1999.

Vermeesch, Albert. *Essai sur les origines et la signification de la commune dans le nord de la France (XIe et XIIe siecles)*. Heule, 1966.

Violante, Cinzio. "La Pataria e la 'Militia Dei' nelle fonti e nelle la realita." In *"Militia Christi" e Crociata nei secoli XI-XIII: Atti della undecima Settimana internazionale di studio, Mendola, 28 agosto–1 settembre 1989*, 103–127. Milan, 1992.

——. *La pataria milanese e la riforma ecclesiastica*. Rome, 1955.

Warichez, Joseph, and Désiré van Bleyenberghe. *L'abbaye de Lobbes depuis les origines jusqu'en 1200*. Tournai, 1909.

Whalen, Brett Edward. *Dominion of God: Christendom and Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge, MA, 2009.

White, Stephen D. "The 'Feudal Revolution'" (II). *Past and Present* 152 (Aug. 1996): 205–223.

——. "Feuding and Peacemaking in the Touraine." *Traditio: Studies in Ancient and Medieval History, Thought, and Religion* 42 (1986): 207–213.

——. "From Peace to Power: The Study of Disputes in Medieval France." In *Medieval Transformations: Texts, Power, and Gifts in Context*, edited by Esther Cohen and Mayke de Jong, 203–218. Leiden, 2001.

——. "'Pactum . . . legem vincit et amor judicium': The Settlement of Disputes by Compromise in Eleventh-Century Western France." *American Journal of Legal History* 22 (1978): 281–309.

——. "The Politics of Anger." In Rosenwein, *Anger's Past*, 127–152.

Wickham, Chris. "The Sense of the Past in Twelfth-Century City Chronicles." In *Land and Power: Studies in Italian and European Social History, 400–1200*, 295–312. London, 1994.

Wolfram, Herwig. *Conrad II, 990–1039: Emperor of Three Kingdoms*. Translated by Denise Adele Kaiser. University Park, PA, 2006.

Zimmermann, Harald. *Der Canossagang von 1077: Wirkungen und Wirklichkeit*. Mainz, 1975.

Index

For literary works, please check pages given for the author, unless the work is anonymous, in which case it will be found under the title.

Adalbero of Laon, 246
Adalbero I of Metz, 35–37, 38, 39, 217
Adalbero III of Metz, 33, 45, 56–57
Adalbert (Count), 35, 39
Adam and Eve, 155, 160–62, 174–76, 181
Adelard of Lobbes, 46–47
Ademar of Chabannes, 246n60
Aelred of Rievaulx, 115, 184–86, 207, 224, 226–29, 288
Agamben, Georgio, 18n35
Agnes of Poitou, 164n46
Aimon of Bourges, 29, 233
Alan of Lille, 13n25, 184
Albert the Bear, 215
Albertanus of Brescia, 295–96
Albigensians (Cathars), 240, 285
Alexander II (pope; formerly Anselm I of Lucca), 10, 58n11, 63, 67, 75, 77, 79, 96n71, 97, 99–100, 105, 117, 265
Alexander III (pope; formerly Roland Bandinelli), 17, 211, 266–67, 269, 274, 275, 276, 278–86, 287, 295
Alfonso II of Aragon, 281
Alger of Liège, 116, 117n6, 119, 123, 129–30, 134, 138–43, 145–51, 163, 195, 196n25
Alpert of Metz, 234
Althoff, Gerd, 185
Ambrose of Milan, 76–77, 299
Andrew of Fleury, 29, 53
Andrew of Strumi, 95, 98–99
Anselm of Canterbury, 179, 244–45, 248
Anselm of Havelberg, 129, 196n22, 197n31, 206–7, 215
Anselm of Laon, 51, 129, 171n86, 172–74, 175n105, 176–79, 202, 203n60, 244, 247, 288
apocalyptic. *See* eschatology
Ariald (Patarene leader), 95, 97–101, 112
Aribert of Milan, 65, 94
Aristotle and Aristotelian theory, 7, 182, 291, 299–300, 302, 303–4
Arnald of Le Mans, 237
Arnold of Brescia, 252, 254–59, 280
Arnulf of Lisieux, 279n59, 281–82
Arnulf of Milan, 17, 76, 78, 94n63, 95, 99–105, 121n22
Arnulf, Count of Toul, 233
Athanasius of Alexandria, 162n38
Atto of Milan, 100, 102
Augustine of Hippo: on Adam and Eve, 155, 160–62; Aelred of Rievaulx and, 185; Alger of Liège and, 138–40; Babion's sermons attributed to, 203; on coercion of schismatics and non-Christians, 134–35, 157; on communion of Judas Iscariot, 111, 125, 131, 149; concept of peace for, 16; *Confessions*, 244n54; *De baptismo contra donatistas*, 116n4, 119n15, 136–37n62–65; *De civitate Dei (City of God)*, 2n1, 7, 74, 113, 137, 156n10, 158n16, 162n39, 175, 245, 273, 291; *De doctrina christiana*, 71, 159n21; *De Genesi ad litteram (Genesis according to the Letter)*, 7, 159n21, 171; *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*, 160–61n26–35, 162n37; *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, 170n81; *Glossa Ordinaria* on Genesis and, 174; human nature, on duel between spirit and flesh in, 4n7, 177; inner peace and internal discipline as problematic for, 155–62, 189; *In Iohannis evangelium tractatus (Tractates on the Gospel of John)*, 7, 51n103, 125n27, 137, 138, 140n75, 141n78, 149n115, 157n12, 158n18–20, 159, 189; Late Antique legacy of peace and, 7–8, 9; Marsilius of

Augustine of Hippo *(continued)*
Padua's use of, 1–2, 299; papal reformers and, 56; on peace as universal human desire, 304; on pleasure as means of grace, 51; political order, conception of, 193; on reception of sacraments, 116, 117, 118, 119n15, 127; *Retractationes*, 157; Rufinus of Sorrento and, 287–88, 291; Rule of, 7, 198n39; sacramentology of, 119, 134–38, 153; *On the Sacraments of the Faithful* (Easter sermon), 140, 145n103

Babion, Geoffrey, 202–3, 204–5, 209, 211–15, 222
Bagge, Sverre, 269, 270
Baldwin IV of Flanders, 28, 32, 44
Baldwin V of Flanders, 28, 32, 42n70, 44, 45, 46, 233
Baldwin VI of Flanders, 44, 46
Baldwin VII of Flanders, 233
Baldwin of Ghent, 231
Baldwin, Marshall, 283n78, 285, 285n88
Bandinelli, Roland. *See* Alexander III
banner or *vexillum* of Saint Peter, 79, 99
Baraz, Daniel, 18
barbarian invasions of Roman empire, 156
Barnes, Timothy D., 82n13, 88n35
Barthélemy, Dominique, 27n18
Bartlett, Robert, 225
Barton, Richard, 218
Bedos-Rezak, Brigitte, 146n104
Behemoth, false peace as sleep of, 3–5, 11, 111, 264
Benedict VIII (pope), 184
Benedict IX (pope), 55n1
Benevento agreement, 277–78
Benkin, Lambert, 260
Beno (cardinal), 68, 69, 70
Benzo of Alba, 70
Berengar of Saint-Lawrence, 107–8
Berengar of Tours, 111, 126–27, 129, 131m139n71, 173n98
Berman, Constance, 225, 226n165
Bernard of Angers, 36–37
Bernard of Clairvaux: Arnold of Brescia and, 254–55, 258; Cistercian peace and, 223–25; Cologne apostles and, 190, 239; *De consideratione*, 6, 254; on discretion as love's discipline, 186–87; on *Glossa Ordinaria*, 173; on heresy as cleaving of scales, 123; on inner peace, 184; on peacemakers, 205; Second (including Wendish) Crusade and, 206, 210, 215, 218, 223–24; sermons of, 171n86, 179n128; world, on relationship to, 191
Bernard of Pisa, 223. *See* Eugenius III
Bernard of S. Clement (cardinal), 276, 277
Bernold of Constance, 81, 120
Bertha (queen of France), 281
Berthold of Reichenau, 120, 122
Bischoff, Guntram, 130n36, 130n40, 132n49, 133
bishops: Cyprian on powers of, 89–90; as leaders of urban communities, 242–43, 245–52
Bisson, Thomas, 14n26, 23, 25
"black and beautiful," church as, 103, 150, 192
Bloch, Marc, 23
Blumenthal, Uta-Renate, 56n4, 78n9, 120–21
Bodin, Jean, 304
Boleslav of Polonia, 216, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222n154
Boniface VIII (pope), 298, 300
Bonizo of Sutri: communion of Judas Iscariot and, 112, 116, 120–22, 126, 235–36; papal reform and, 63, 74; sacraments and, 96n71, 97n77–78, 97n79, 98n80, 99, 100n92, 101n93
Bonnassie, Pierre, 23
Bonnaud-Delamare, Roger, 32, 48n94, 64
Boso (cardinal), 17, 255, 279, 280, 282, 284
Boureau, Alain, 236
Bourges commune, diocesan association, and Peace League, 29, 233n10, 261
Bournazel, Eric, 23
Brown, Peter, 83n18, 157
Bruno of Chartres, 173n98
Bruno of Segni, 112, 166–69, 201–4, 210–11, 213, 291
Bruno of Toul. *See* Leo IX
Buc, Philippe, 103, 174n104, 175n114, 199n49, 235, 275
Bynum, Caroline Walker, 144, 188n167

Caciola, Nancy, 188n167
Calatrava, Order of, 224
canonical validity, 10, 57
canons regular and secular, 7
Canossa, false peace at, 119–23, 126, 128, 235–36
captivity: Babylonian, 1, 184, 293; clerical reimagination of peace and, 53, 54;

communes and, 231, 237, 239n35, 252, 253, 257, 258, 259, 261; of false sacraments, 56, 61, 74, 75, 79, 95, 103–4, 107, 109, 111, 123; inner peace and, 162, 178, 183, 186, 188; Late Antique legacy regarding, 9; mimicry and, 12n21; secular peace and, 265, 266, 298; violence, medieval concept of, 6, 18
Capuciati of Auxerre, 233, 240–42
Carolingians: ecclesiology of, 110n127; exegesis of, 172, 173; limitations on monarchical overreach and sacramental unity, 118; peace concepts of, 32–33, 37, 64; political system, devolution of, 23–25, 93; Three Orders as social imagining of, 292
Carthage, Council of (256), 93n59
Cathars, 240, 285
Cathedral schools, rise of, 171–72
Celestine II (pope), 256
Censius, 121
Charlemagne, crowned by pope, 64
Charles II the Bald (Holy Roman Emperor and king of West Francia), 292n119
Charles of Constance, 105
Charles the Good of Flanders, 230–31, 260
Charles of Lorraine, 246
Chenu, Marie-Dominique, 10
Cheyette, Fredric, 146
Cistercian peace, 223–29
Clement II (pope; formerly Suidger of Bamberg), 55n1, 164
Clement of Alexandria, 87n32
clerical reimagination of peace, 1–3, 21–54; authority refuted in name of peace, 1–2, 299–303; identity as clergy and peace concerns, 10, 22; Lotharingian monastic reform and, 32–42; mission of clergy, peace as, 14–15, 22, 199–207; papal reform of clergy and, 10, 54, 57–59; Peace of God movement and, 10, 21, 22, 25, 26, 32 (*See also* Peace of God movement); social and political context of, 22–27; violent action, responsibility for, 113–14. *See also* Ursmar of Lobbes, miracles of
clerical resistance to lay spiritual movements, 296
Cluny (abbey), 22, 33–34, 37, 163, 164, 173n95, 223
Codagnelli,, Giovanni, 261–62
Cohn, Norman, 103
Cologne apostles, 190–91, 239–40
communes, 230–63; bishops as leaders of urban communities and, 242–43, 245–52; conflict conditions, arising out of, 232–34; as conspiracies, 231, 234, 238, 249, 254, 260, 265; eucharistic theology and, 148; fidelity and peace, links between, 14; as inversions or perversions, 231, 232, 234–43, 249, 251; negative clerical conceptions of, 54, 230–32, 243, 266; papal militarism and, 252–50; Pataria and, 95; *sacramenta* (oaths) of, 12, 30, 231, 232–39; transformation into acceptable form of urban organization, 260–63, 265–68, 282–83; use of peacemaking vocabulary by, 231; as useful scandals, 230–31. *See also specific communes, e.g.* Laon commune
communion, 115–52; Alger of Liège on, 134, 138–43, 145–46, 147, 148, 150–51; Augustine on reception of, 116, 117, 118, 119n15, 127; Augustinian sacramentology and, 119, 134–38; Berengar of Tours on, 111, 126–27, 129, 131; body of Christ, increasing association with, 144–45, 148; community and membership, views on, 132–34, 138–45; Cyprian's sacramentology and, 116–19, 135, 136, 137–38; desecration of Host, growing concerns about, 148–49; eastern church, papal conflict with, 60; ecclesiology and, 133–34; as exemplar of peace, 13, 31; institutional church and, 145–47; as oath or promise, 145; Rupert of Deutz on, 132–34, 139–40; *sacramentum tenens*, 110–11; schismatic or heretical, 12, 147–52
communion of Judas Iscariot: Alger of Liège on, 116, 117n6, 119, 123, 129–30, 149–50; Augustine on, 111, 125, 131, 149; Canossa, false peace at, 119–23, 126, 128, 235–36; communal oaths and, 235–36; Guibert of Nogent on, 115, 126, 246, 247, 250; Guitmund of Aversa on, 126–28; New Testament accounts of, 124–25, 131; Otbert of Liège and, 108, 123, 126, 128–29; Rupert of Deutz on, 108, 111, 119, 123, 126, 128–31; spiritual unity of church, Judas's break with, 149–50, 194–95; tying together of related concerns about peace in, 116–18, 125–26, 146

Conrad II (Holy Roman Emperor), 9, 65, 94, 95, 302
Conrad III (Holy Roman Emperor), 215, 256–57
"consortium" of the wicked, 67, 78, 104
conspiracies, communes as, 231, 234, 238, 249, 254, 260, 265
Constance, Treaty of (1183), 273, 277, 303
Constantine (Roman emperor), 55n1, 82, 103, 192, 256, 274, 298, 300
Cowdrey, H. E. J., 30n29, 94, 100n91, 102n97, 104n105, 121n20, 164
Crusades: First Crusade, 11, 28, 190, 233; Second Crusade, 206, 207, 210, 215, 216, 218 (*See also* Wends); Third Crusade, Richard the Lionhearted on, 164, 224; Albigensian Crusade, 240; Pataria as proto-Crusade, 99; Zenghid resurgence in Holy Land and, 223, 224n157
Cuno of Siegburg, 131n43
curiositas, 191, 207, 224–25, 227
Cyprian of Carthage: *De lapsis (On the Lapsed)*, 8n12–13, 77–78, 87n33, 89n41–42, 90n45–46, 118n11–13; Donatists and, 81, 85, 88, 92, 135; on episcopal powers, 89–90; experience of Roman persecutions and reconciliation of lapsed after, 85, 86–92; Gregorian reform and, 56, 75, 80, 81, 92–93; Late Antique legacy on peace and, 8–9, 10; martyrs, efforts to control, 90–92; on sacraments, 77–78, 80, 81, 87–90, 91–92, 116–19, 135, 136, 137–38, 236; significance for medieval church reform, 81–82, 92–93

Dalton, Paul, 184–85, 226
Damasus II (pope), 55n1
Dante Alighieri, *De monarchia*, 297–99, 302
David I (king of Scotland), 227
De unitate ecclesiae conservanda, 71, 72n60, 92n58
Decius (Roman emperor), 8, 86–87, 87n32
Deeds of the Bishops of Auxerre, 241–42
Deeds of the Bishops of Cambrai, 21, 45n80, 115
Deeds of the Bishops of Le Mans, 238
Desportes, Pierre, 261n132
Dietrich of Metz, 172n90
diocesan associations, 29, 233n10, 242, 261
Diocletian (Roman emperor), 211
Domizlav, Duke of Stettin, 219–20
Donation of Constantine, 298, 300
Donatists, 81, 85, 88, 92, 103, 116, 119n15, 134–36, 157, 192–93
Drogo of Paris, 173n98
Dubar, Luc, 261n132
Duby, Georges, 10, 24n5, 53, 240n37, 241
Dudziak, Mary L., 18n35
Dunstan (Anglo-Saxon saint), 227
Durand of Le Puy, 240, 241
Dutton, Marsha, 226

eastern church, papal conflict with, 60, 210
Ebbo of Michelsberg, 216, 217–18, 219n140, 220, 222n152–53, 223n155–56
Ebles de Roucy, 79, 99
ecclesiology: "black and beautiful," church as, 103, 150, 192; Carolingian, 110n127; communion and, 133–34; communion of Judas Iscariot and, 149–50, 194–95; eucharistic subjectivity and institutional transformation, 145–47; world, Christian relationship to, 192–99
Edgar (Anglo-Saxon king), 227
Einold of Gorze, 34, 39
Elliott, Dyan, 189n170
Enarrationes in evangelium Matthaei, 202–4, 214–15
Enguerrand de Coucy, 99
Enguerrand de Boves, 247
Enguerrand of Laon, 246–47
Erlembald (Patarine leader), 17n32, 76–79, 95n67, 98–101, 104, 105, 112
eschatology: as danger to peace, 155–56; ecclesiological embrace of both pious and wicked and, 193; imperial peace of Frederick Barbarossa as end of history, 273–76; millennial violence, 5–6, 9, 22–27; as peace, 209–14
Eucharist. *See* communion
Eugenius III (pope; formerly Bernard of Pisa), 6n9, 206n76, 210, 215, 223, 254–56, 259, 271, 280
Eusebius of Caesarea, 83n19
evangelization and peace, 19, 191, 206–7, 214–22, 295
Evervin of Steinfeld, 190, 239–40
exegesis: Carolingian, 172, 173; of Genesis, 163–69, 174–76, 178–82; of John's gospel, 131, 137–138; of Matthew's gospel, 200–206, 207–215; *Glossa Ordinaria* (Ordinary Gloss), 62, 172–76, 182, 203, 204, 299; as internal discipline, 170–71, 188–89, 244; monastic, 170–71;

scholastic, 170–72; theological and exegetical treatments of peace, 13–15
exorcism as peacemaking, 50, 200, 215
Ezekiel (prophet), 2, 11, 17, 49, 61–64, 70–71, 113, 245, 293, 303

false peace versus true peace. *See* clerical reimagination of peace; peace in medieval Europe
false sacraments. *See* communion; communion of Judas Iscariot; sacraments and peace
Ferguson, James, 12n21
fidelity and peace, 13–14, 66, 70–72, 74
filioque clause, 60
Folcuin of Lobbes, 34, 43, 46
Foy (saint), 36–37
Franciscan Order, 295, 298
Frederick Barbarossa (Holy Roman Emperor): Alexander III and, 278–86; *Gesta Frederici*, 257, 269, 277; Hadrian IV, breakdown of relations with, 276–78; imperial peace of Frederick as end of history, 273–76; invasion of northern Italy by, 266–67, 272–73, 302–3; peacemaking vocabulary of, 268–73; Roman commune and, 243, 257, 259–60, 261, 273
Frederick of Muenster, 271
free will. *See* inner peace and internal discipline
Fulk Nerra, 22–23

Galbert of Bruges, 260
Gallus (Roman emperor), 86, 91
Garnett, George, 302n19
Gaudry of Amiens, 235
Gaudry of Laon, 115, 178–79, 230, 245, 247–51, 280
Genesis: Augustine of Hippo on, 155, 160–62; *Glossa Ordinaria* on, 174–76; medieval exegesis of, 163–69, 174–76, 178–82
Geoffrey of Saint-Martial of Limoges, 240
Gerard of Cambrai, 9, 21–22, 32, 44, 45n80, 53, 54
Gerard de Quierzy, 249
Gerhoh of Reichersberg, 11, 145, 151, 193–94, 211–12, 274, 278, 287
"Gershonites," 197
Gesta episcoporum Mettensium, 33n39, 57
Gilbert of Auxerre (Gilbert the Universal), 174, 175
Glaber, Raoul, 23, 26n14, 30–31, 50, 53
Glossa Ordinaria (Ordinary Gloss), 62, 172–76, 182, 203, 204, 299
Godfrey the Bearded (count of Lotharingia), 107
Godfrey the Hunchback (count of Lotharingia), 107
Godfrey of Maine, 237
Godfrey of Milan, 102
Godfrey of Viterbo, 256
Goetz, Hans-Werner, 28
Gorgon (saint), 36
Görich, Knut, 266–67n8
Gorze (abbey), 33–35, 37, 39, 108
Gottschalk of Aachen, 70
Gratian, *Decretum*, 13, 151, 286
Gregory I the Great (pope): in Alan of Lille's *Ars praedicandi*, 13n25; on apostasy as dog returning to his vomit, 31, 50, 115; *Book of Orders and Professions*, 11; *Homiliae in Hiezechihelem prophetam (Homilies on Ezekiel)*, 2, 13, 49–50, 303; on human nature, 162n38; on inner peace and internal discipline, 165, 189; on learning from the world, 11, 12; Milanese rite allowed by, 95; *Moralia in Job*, 18n34, 62n26, 171, 179, 198n37, 237, 244n54; Peter Lombard's use of, 301n15; on priests damning unjustly, 113; *Regulae pastoralis liber (Pastoral Care)*, 2, 12n23, 74, 228
Gregory VI (pope; formerly John Gratian), 55n1, 63, 164
Gregory VII (pope; formerly Hildebrand), 10, 61–75; Alexander III compared, 269, 280, 283, 284; Arnold of Brescia compared, 254; Berengar of Tours and, 126; Bruno of Segni and, 167, 168, 201; character, background, and ecclesiastical career, 63–64, 67; clerical reimagination of peace and, 31, 41, 54; Cyprian of Carthage and, 56, 75, 80, 81, 92–93; Dante's *De monarchia and*, 298; development of imperial hegemony, 64–67; election to papacy, 67; in exile with Pope Gregory VI, 55n1, 164n46; Ezekiel 17 and, 61–64, 70–71, 105, 293; Gerhoh of Reichersberg and, 274; investiture controversy, 11, 54, 63, 67–71, 79–80, 93, 101, 102, 105; Mathilda of Tuscany-Canossa and, 107n112, 119; Pataria

Gregory VII *(continued)*
and, 77, 78–80, 93, 96–97, 99–105; Peter Damian and, 65, 163, 166; radicalized concept of peace and reform, 56, 60–61, 63, 68, 72–75, 103–5; sacramental authenticity fueling reforms of, 62, 66–69, 70, 74–75, 79; violent action and, 69–74, 81, 103–4, 111–12, 113. *See also* investiture controversy
Guerric of Igny, 17n31
Guibert of Nogent: clerical reimagination of peace and, 51; on communion of Judas Iscariot, 115, 126, 246, 247, 250; eucharistic theology of, 111, 129n35, 142–43; on God's use of evil for his own ends, 194n12; on inner peace and internal discipline, 178–79, 185, 186; on Laon commune, 230, 243–52, 280; *Monodies*, 244; Soissons, quasi-Manichaean rituals at, 149, 179, 236
Guitmund of Aversa, 119, 126–28
Guy of Le Puy, 27, 29
Guy of Milan, 96–97, 100

Hadrian IV (pope), 211, 274, 275, 276–79, 280
Harding, Stephen, 226
Häring, Nicholas, 81, 138–39
Harnack, Adolf, 11n19, 19n38, 84n20
Haskins, Charles Homer, 6
Hehl, Ernst-Dieter, 13
Hein, Kenneth, 138n68
Helinande of Namur, 247
Henry II (king of England), 163, 224, 226–27, 283
Henry II (Holy Roman Emperor), 21
Henry III (Holy Roman Emperor), 37, 42n70, 45, 46, 55, 59, 65, 66, 75, 94, 164, 165, 233
Henry IV (King of the Romans and Holy Roman Emperor), 28, 31, 63, 65–71, 107, 126, 128–29, 163, 166. *See also* investiture controversy
Henry VII (Holy Roman Emperor), 300
Henry of Beauvais, 281n69
Henry the Lion, Duke of Saxony, 270
Herbord of Michelsberg, 216, 217n128–31, 218n135, 218n137, 219–21, 222n153–54
Héric of Auxerre, 292n119
Heriger of Lobbes, 43, 46
Herman of Tournai, 230, 273n32
Hilary of Poitiers, 131
Hildebert of Lavardin, 203, 209n90
Hildebrand. *See* Gregory VII
Hillenbrand, Carole, 224n157
Himiltrud of Ste-Glossinde, 36
Hippolytus of Rome, 11–12
historiographical view of era as violent and anarchic, 5–6, 9, 22–27
Hobbes, Thomas, 304
Homobonus of Cremona, 295
Honorius Augustodunensis, 213
Hrabanus Maurus, 173, 203n63
Hugh of Auxerre, 240–42
Hugh Candidus of Remiremont, 56
Hugh Capet, 246
Hugh of Lyons, 108, 110
Hugh of Saint-Victor: clerical reimagination of peace and, 11, 52; *De sacramentis Christianae fidae*, 144, 182–83, 300; *Didascalicon*, 182; on duel between spirit and flesh in human nature, 251; on ecclesial community, 193, 194n12; on evangelical peacemaking, 214n115; on inner peace and exegesis, 169n79, 170n84, 181–84, 185, 187, 244n53; on sacraments, 113, 117, 123, 129, 143–44, 147, 236
Huguccio of Pisa, 297
Humbert of Saint-Evre, 33, 35, 38
Humbert of Silva Candida, 56, 58n12, 59, 60, 63, 78n9, 81, 92, 111, 117, 119, 163, 165
Humiliati, 258n122, 296
Hus, Jan, 302

imitatio Christi, 144–45
imperial authority: development of Ottonian-Salian hegemony, 64–67; Leo IX's reforms and, 59–60, 63; in northern Italy, 93–94. *See also* Frederick Barbarossa; investiture controversy; Roman empire
inner peace and internal discipline, 153–89; Aelred of Rievaulx on, 184–86; Anselm of Laon and, 171n86, 172–74, 175n105, 176–79; as Augustinian problematic, 155–62, 189; Christ's Passion as submission of Jesus to divine will, 169–70; discernment and discretion, cultivation of, 178–79, 186–88; exegesis as form of, 170–71, 188–89, 244 (*See also* exegesis); Guibert of Nogent on, 178–81; Hugh of Saint-Victor on, 181–84, 187; human nature, duel between spirit and flesh in,

4, 6, 153–55, 176–78, 188, 266; Peter Damian on, 163, 165–66, 169, 187
Innocent II (pope), 254, 255–56
Innocent III (pope), 295, 298
investiture controversy: Canossa, false peace at, 119–23, 126, 128, 235–36; papal encouragement of insurrection against false peace, 265–66, 293; papal reform and, 11, 54, 63, 67–71, 79–80; *sacramenta* (oaths), 66, 67–71, 75, 79; sacraments and peace, 62, 66–69, 70, 74–75, 79–80, 93, 105, 107. *See also* Gregory VII; Henry IV
Iogna-Prat, Dominique, 292n119
Isaac of Stella, 163, 184, 189n169, 224, 227
Isidore of Seville, 194n17, 236, 290
Islamic tradition, peace in, 18–19
Ivo of Chartres, 139, 235

Jaeger, Stephen, 172
Jasomirgott, Henry, 270
Jeremiah (prophet), 1–2, 6, 71, 72
Jerome, 17, 62, 113
Jestice, Phyllis, 39, 40n65
Jews and Judaism, 18, 148, 169, 208–9, 213, 240, 285
Joachim of Fiore, 164, 171n86, 224
John Chrysostom, 199
John of Gorze, 33–35, 38–39, 53, 217
John of Saint-Arnoul, *Vita Johannis Gorziensis*, 35, 38–39
John of Salisbury: *Historia pontificalis*, 254n102, 258–59; *Policraticus*, 13, 237, 287, 290, 293n124
John XXII (pope), 297
Jones, Philip, 243
Judas Iscariot, communion of. *See* communion of Judas Iscariot

Keller, Hagen, 261n133
Kerularios, Michael (patriarch of Constantinople), 60, 210
Koziol, Geoffrey, 48–49

Lactantius, 19n37, 83n19, 156
Ladner, Gerhart, 81
Lambert of St.-Omer, *Liber floridus*, 4
Lampert of Herzfeld, 122
Landfriede, 28
Landulf Senior, 93n60, 95, 99–100
Lanfranc of Bec, 126, 139, 173n98
Laon commune, 230, 232, 233, 235n16, 243–52
Late Antique concepts of peace, 7–9, 19
Lateran II (Second Lateran Council; 1139), 254
Lateran III (Third Lateran Council; 1179), 3, 239, 285–86, 288, 295
Lateran IV (Fourth Lateran Council; 1215), 295
Lauranson-Rosaz, Christian, 25n9, 29
lay spiritual movements, clerical resistance to, 296
Le Goff, Jacques, 48n91
Le Mans commune, 237–38
Lees, Jay T., 215
Lemarignier, J.-F., 23
Leo I the Great (pope), 131
Leo III (pope), 64
Leo IX (pope; formerly Bruno of Toul): Bruno of Segni on, 167; clerical reimagination of peace and, 10, 33–34, 37, 45; Otto of Bamberg compared, 217; papal reforms of, 53–61, 65, 68, 75, 78, 117, 209–10; Peter Damian and, 163, 164–65
Leviathan, 4
Lewis, Suzanne, 4n6
Lex Bavariorum and *Lex Visigothorum*, 33
Libellus de diversis ordinibus et professionibus qui sunt in ecclesia (The Little Book of Diverse Orders and Professions That Are in the Church), 195–99
Lidprand (Patarene leader), 95n67, 101–4
Lietbert of Cambrai, 107n114, 206n78
Lille commune, 233
Little Exord, 226
Little, Lester, 98n81
Lobbes. *See* Ursmar of Lobbes, peacemaking miracles of
Lobrichon, Guy, 171n86, 172n91, 173n94
Lombard League, 267, 272, 284, 302–3
Lotharingian monastic reform: clerical reimagination of peace and, 32–42; Henry IV, Otbert of Liège, and Urban II, 107–11, 128–31; papal reform and, 56–57
Louis VI the Fat (king of France), 58n15, 235, 250, 261n132, 268n10
Lubac, Henri de, 212n101
Lucius II (pope), 256, 257
Ludus de Antichristo, 274–75
Ludwig of Bavaria (Louis IV, Holy Roman Emperor), 300, 302

Manichaeans, 149, 159, 236
Manuel (Greek emperor), 17
Markus, Robert, 157, 162n38, 193
Marsilius of Padua, *Defensor pacis* (Defender of the Peace; 1324), 1–2, 15, 299–303
martyrdom: Christians persecuted in Roman empire, 8–9, 81–83, 86–88, 91–92, 103, 135; Cyprian's efforts to control, 90–92; Pataria and, 98–99, 102–4; Perpetua, Felicitas, and Saturus, Passion diaries of, 83n19, 86n30, 88n35; as second baptism for those in grave sin, 85
Mathilda (empress and contender for English throne), 184
Mathilda of Tuscany-Canossa, 107n112, 119
Meaux, Synod of (845), 66
Mensurius of Carthage, 135
Milanese Pataria. *See* Pataria
Milanese rite, 76–77, 95
millennialism. *See* eschatology
mimicry, benefits and dangers of, 10, 11–12, 53
Miracula Gorgonii, 35
missionary activity (evangelization) and peace, 19, 191, 206–7, 214–22
Molesme (abbey), 106–7
monasteries and monasticism: Cistercian peace, 223–29; community and peace, theological positions on, 132–34; exegesis of, 170–71; inner peace, importance of, 184–85, 188; Lotharingian monastic reform and concepts of peace, 32–42; Urban II and Victor III, reforms of, 105–6. *See also* Ursmar of Lobbes, peacemaking miracles of; *specific abbeys*
Montanism, 85, 88n35, 150
Moore, R. I., 26n13, 286
Morrison, Karl, 64, 66n35, 110n127, 165, 195n20
Munz, Peter, 266n8, 278, 279

Nebuchadnezzar (king of Babylon), 1–2, 61–62, 71, 105, 293
Neoplatonism, 16, 182
Nero (Roman emperor), 211
Newman, Martha, 225
Nicholas II (pope), 10, 60, 80, 112
nicolaitism (clerical marriage and concubinage), 10, 57, 96, 97
Nightingale, John, 35–36, 45n82
Norbert of Xanten, 197n31, 206n77
Norman Anonymous, 92
North, William, 167n64, 201n53
Notker of Liège, 34, 43
Novatus, 90n46

oath-based political associations. *See* communes
oaths. *See sacramenta*
Odilo of Cluny, 164
Odo of Deuil, 29
Odo of Toul, 233
Oexle, Otto Gerhard, 232n5, 234, 262, 265
Optatus of Milevus, 135–36
Origen, 162n38, 171, 298n5
Otbert of Liège, 41, 52n108, 58n11, 106–11, 123, 126, 128–31, 163
Ott, John S., 107n114
Otto I (Holy Roman Emperor), 64
Otto II (Holy Roman Emperor), 64
Otto III (Holy Roman Emperor), 37, 55n1, 64–65
Otto of Bamberg, 216–23
Otto of Freising, 255–58, 269–74, 286
Otto of Wittelsbach, 278–79

pacifici (peacemakers), clergy as, 14–15, 22, 199–207
papal reform and peace, 10, 55–75; clergy, reform of, 10, 54, 57–59; eastern church, conflict with, 60; election of popes, 60; investiture controversy, 11, 54, 63, 67–71, 79–80; under Leo IX, 53–61, 65, 68, 75, 78, 117, 209–10; under Nicholas II, 10, 60, 80, 112; Patarene revolt and, 95–98; Roman commune and, 252–60; Sigebert of Gembloux's denunciation of papal militarism, 252–54; under Urban II, 105–11; under Victor III, 105–6. *See also* Gregory VII
papal sovereignty refuted in name of peace, 1–2
Paris, Synod of (829), 65–66
Paschal II (pope), 10, 73, 108n118, 129, 167, 247–48, 252–53, 280
Paschasius Radbertus, 127, 151n124
Pataria, 93–105; communes compared, 233, 239; context and origins of, 93–96; Gregory VII's encouragement of, 77, 78–80, 93, 96–97, 99–105; papal reform movement and, 95–98; Peter Damian and, 96–97, 99, 164; sacraments and,

76–79, 97–98, 101–5, 112; uprising against and overthrow of, 100, 101–2
"Patarini" (as term for heretics), 239, 285
Patzold, Steffen, 45n82
Paul of Bernried, 67, 72–73, 126n29
Pax Romana, 6, 19, 60, 65, 298n5
peace in medieval Europe, 1–20; clerical reimagination of, 1–3, 21–54 (*See also* clerical reimagination of peace); communion and, 115–52 (*See also* communion; communion of Judas Iscariot); concept of, 15–20; historical value of studying, 5–7; historiographical view of era as violent and anarchic, 5–6, 9, 22–27; internal, 153–89 (*See also* inner peace and internal discipline); as Late Antique legacy, 7–9, 19; papal reform and, 10, 55–75 (*See also* papal reform and peace); Rufinus of Sorrento, events shaping systematization of peace by, 264–96 (*See also* Rufinus of Sorrento); sacraments and, 10, 76–114 (*See also* sacraments and peace); secular government and, 297–304 (*See also* secular government); "sleep of Behemoth," false peace as, 3–5, 11, 111, 264; social and political context, 9–12, 22–27; theological and exegetical treatments of, 13–15 (*See also* exegesis); violence, relationship to, 6, 15–18 (*See also* violence and medieval concepts of peace)
Peace League of Bourges, 233
Peace of Amiens-Corbie (1034), 32
Peace of God movement, 27–31; clerical reimagination of peace and, 10, 21, 22, 25, 26, 32; communes and, 232; historical interest in, 13; Leo IX's reforms and, 56, 58, 59; meaning of peace, questioning, 3; standard images for nonpeaceful in, 115; Three Orders and, 292; Ursmar of Lobbes, peacemaking miracles of, 43, 44
Peace of Milan, 272
Perpetua, Felicitas, and Saturus, Passion diaries of, 83n19, 86n30, 88n35
Peter Abelard, 126, 173, 254
Peter of Alexandria, 88n34
Peter the Chanter, 178n121
Peter Crassus, 70
Peter Damian: clerical reimagination of peace and, 41, 53; on inner peace and internal discipline, 163, 165–66, 169, 187; life and context, 163–65; papal reform and, 57n4, 60–61, 65; Pataria and, 96–97, 99, 164; sacramentology and, 78n9, 111, 117, 119, 130
Peter of Hamersleben, 206n77
Peter Lombard, 182n141, 301n15
Peter the Venerable, 150
Petit-Dutaillis, Charles, 239
Philip the Arab (Roman emperor), 86
Philip Augustus (king of France), 235, 236, 240, 260–61, 268n10
pia violentia, 17
Piacenza, origins of, 262
Poly, Jean-Pierre, 23
Pomeranians, Otto of Bamberg's mission to, 216–22
preaching manuals, 13n25
Pseudo-Dionysius, 288

Quest of the Holy Grail, 163

Rahewin, 277
Rainald of Dassel, 276, 279, 282
Ralph of Laon, 172, 174
Rather of Verona, 43
Raymond of Toulouse, 240–41
real peace versus false peace. *See* clerical reimagination of peace; peace in medieval Europe
Remensnyder, Amy, 59
Reuter, Timothy, 64, 65n31
Richard I the Lionhearted (king of England), 163–64, 224
Richard of Saint-Victor, 182n141
Richard of Saint-Vanne, 34, 53
Richer of Reims, 246n60
Rigord, 240
Robert the Pious (king of France), 21, 28
Robert of Auxerre, 241
Robert of Flanders, 73, 93n59, 108n118, 129, 252
Robert of Molesme, 226
Robinson, Ian S., 65, 167n62
Roland (cardinal), 278–79
Roman commune, 231, 252–60, 273
Roman empire: barbarian invasions of, 156; Christian relationship to world of, 81–86; Christianization of, 19, 82, 103, 155–56, 192–93, 274; military terminology, Christian appropriation of, 83–84; *Pax Romana*, 6, 19, 60, 65, 298n5; persecution of Christians by, 8–9, 81–83, 86–88, 91–92, 103, 135

Rubenstein, Jay, 142–43, 179n128, 181, 249n76
Rufinus of Sorrento, 264–96; Augustinianism of, 287–88, 291; on clerical responsibility for peace, 15; communes and, 263, 265–68, 282–83; concept of peace for, 16; *De bono pacis (On the Goodness of Peace)*, 13, 264–65, 286–95; on diabolical/false peace, 3, 111, 151, 154n1, 264; events shaping systematization of peace by, 264–67; Peace of Babylon (civic peace), 15, 263, 264–65, 267, 286–96, 299; Peace of Egypt (wicked peace), 264, 265, 289, 290, 292–93, 295; Peace of Jerusalem (peace of the church), 263, 264, 287, 289, 290–91, 293, 295; typology of peace, 288–89; violence, use of, 290–91. *See also* Frederick Barbarossa
Rupert of Deutz: *Commentaria in evangelium sancti Iohannis*, 130n40, 131; on communion, 132–34, 139–40; on communion of Judas Iscariot, 108, 111, 119, 123, 126, 128–31; *De divinis officiis*, 130; on eschatology as peace, 211, 214; Guibert of Nogent compared, 244; on inner peace and internal discipline, 169–70, 173, 195n22; on offers of peace, 207–9; on peacemaking, 202, 205–6

sacramenta (oaths): authenticity of, 117; of communes, 12, 30, 231, 232–39; communion as oath or promise, 145; concept of, 28–30; Gregorian reform and investiture controversy, 66, 67–71, 75, 79; heretical/diabolical, 147; Otto of Bamberg in Pomerania and, 221; of Pataria, 97
sacraments and peace, 10, 76–114; Augustinian sacramentology, 119, 134–38, 153; authenticity of conferral and reception of, 116–18; as bonds, 105, 111, 117; Cyprian of Carthage on, 77–78, 80, 81, 87–90, 91–92, 116–19, 135, 136, 137–38, 236; Gregorian reform and investiture controversy, 62, 66–69, 70, 74–75, 79–80, 93, 105, 107; heightened 11th-century concern over, 111; Pataria and, 76–79, 97–98, 101–5; revolt as liberation from violent (illicit) sacraments, 79, 105–14; Rufinus of Sorrento on, 288; Tertullian on, 83–85. *See also* communion; communion of Judas Iscariot
Saint-Hubert of Amdain (abbey), 106–11, 128–31
salt ("of the earth") and peace, 204, 291
scholastic exegesis, 170–72
secular government, 297–304; clerical authority refuted in name of peace of, 1–2, 299–303; Dante's *De monarchia*, 297–99, 302; Marsilius of Padua, *Defensor pacis* (*Defender of the Peace;* 1324), 1–2, 15, 299–303; Rufinus of Sorrento's Peace of Babylon, 15, 263, 264–65, 267, 286–96, 299; sacramental abuses and, 10. *See also* communes; imperial authority
Seneca, 13n25
Sens, Council of, 254, 255
Septimius Severus (Roman emperor), 86n29
Sermon on the Mount, 177, 201–2, 203–4, 223
Siegfried of Mainz, 105
Sigebert of Gembloux, 59n20, 62n25–26, 67n43, 70n51, 113, 172n90, 252–54, 280
Silvester III (pope), 55n1
simony, 10, 57–58, 96, 97, 115, 130n40, 246
"sleep of Behemoth," false peace as, 3–5, 11, 111, 264
Smalley, Beryl, 170, 172n91, 175n105, 176n115–16, 178n121
Smith, Lesley, 178n121
social engagement with world. *See* world, Christian relationship to
Soissons, quasi-Manichaean rituals at, 149, 179, 236
Solomon (biblical king), peace imagery associated with, 214–15, 222, 227
Southern, Richard, 13, 22–23, 154
Spijker, Ineke van 't, 182n141
Stephan of Tournai, 123, 236
Stephen I (pope), 96n71
Stephen of Blois (king of England), 184, 224, 226
Stock, Brian, 131n45
structural violence, 18

Taylor, Jerome, 215n123
Tedald of Milan, 102
Tellenbach, Gerd, 4, 64
Tertullian, 11, 19, 50, 82–86, 134, 150
Teutonic Knights, 216
Theban martyrs, 68
Theoderic of Verdun, 70
Theodore of Saint-Laurence, 106, 108, 129
Theodosius (Roman emperor), 135
theological and exegetical treatments of peace, 13–15. *See also* exegesis

Therouanne, peace council of (1963), 43
Thomas Becket, 163, 283
Thompson, Augustine, 154n3
Three Orders, 9, 32, 183n146, 292
Tiel confraternity, 234
Tilley, Maureen, 82n13, 86n30
Toul commune, 233
Tournai commune, 236
Tours, Council of, 281–82
Trinity, peace associated with, 16
Truce of God, 28, 43, 45, 233, 298n5
true peace versus false peace. *See* clerical reimagination of peace; peace in medieval Europe
Tyconius (Donatist), 103, 150, 192–93, 194

Unam Sanctam, 184, 300
urban communes. *See* communes
Urban II (pope; formerly Odo of Cluny), 10, 28, 41, 54, 58n11, 93n59, 105–11, 126, 128, 167, 233, 265
urban oath collectives. *See* communes
Ursmar of Lobbes, peacemaking miracles of, 41–53; abbey of Lobbes, 42–43, 46–47; dog/devil, pollution of peace ceremony by, 42, 49–50; *Gesta abbatum Lobbiensium continuata*, 44; legend of St. Ursmar, 46; Leo IX's reforms and, 58–59; *Miracula sancti Ursmari*, 43, 46, 47, 49, 51–52, 53, 219; nature of peace offered by, 43–45, 47–54; Otto of Bamberg in Pomerania compared, 219, 220; relics tour, 42, 43–44, 46–51; self-understanding of monks of Lobbes, 45–46

Valenciennes, Pax of, 14, 232, 238–39, 260
Valerius (Roman emperor), 86
Van Meter, David C., 32n34, 41n67
Vauchez, André, 239n34
Vermeesch, Albert, 242n49
vexillum or banner of Saint Peter, 79, 99
Victor III (pope; formerly Desiderius of Monte-Cassino), 105–6
Victor IV/Cardinal Octavian (antipope), 278–83
vinculae (bonds/chains): of anathema *(vinculae anathematatis)*, 31; of excommunication *(vinculae excommunicationis)*, 74; *of peace (vinculae pacis)*, 69, 74, 77, 123, 134, 137n65, 142, 145
violence and medieval concepts of peace, 6, 15–18; captivity and, 6, 18 (*See also* captivity); clerical presentation of violence, 53–54; clerical responsibility for violence, 113–14; communes arising out of conflict conditions, 232–34; fighting without violence and violence without fighting, 112–13; Gregory VII's reforms and, 69–74, 81, 103–4, 111–12, 113; inner peace, conflict as part of (*See* inner peace and internal discipline); Lotharingian monastic reform and, 39–41; millennial violence, 5–6, 9, 22–27; Pataria in open conflict with Milanese authorities, 98–99; Roman military terminology, Christian appropriation of, 83–84; Rufinus of Sorrento, *De bono pacis*, 290–91; sacramental concerns and, 79, 105–14
Vita Augskari, 39
Vita Henrici, 120

Waldensians, 296
Walter of Cambrai, 32
Wazo of Liège, 165
Wends (Wendish Crusade), 206–207, 215, 216, 224
White, Stephen D., 23n3, 25n11, 48, 218
Wibald of Stablo, 257n115
Wibert of Ravenna, 69
Wickham, Chris, 262
Wido of Ferrara, 70
Wido of Osnabrück, 70
Widukind of Corvey, 26n14
the will. *See* inner peace and internal discipline
William I the Conqueror (Duke of Normandy and king of England), 77, 99, 237
William of Saint-Thierry, 151, 163, 193, 206–7
William of Sicily, 278n54
William of Ypres, 260
Wiredus of Saint-Hubert of Amdain, 106, 108
world, Christian relationship to, 190–229; Cistercian peace, 223–29; clergy as peacemakers in world, 199–207; the ecclesial community, 192–99; eschatology and, 209–14; evangelization, 19, 191, 206–7, 214–22, 295; Gregory the Great on learning from the world, 11, 12; offers of peace, 207–9; Roman empire and early Christians, 81–86; spiritual leaders and their flocks, peace between, 222–23
Wortizlav of Pomerania, 216, 217, 218, 219

Zedekiah (Israelite ruler), 61–62, 71, 105